

KANSAS.

C. M. Heaton, Lincoln.
Thomas L. Hogue, Olathe.

NEBRASKA.

William Cook, Hebron.
Edward G. Hall, David City.
Lew E. Shelley, Fairbury.
Clarence E. Stine, Superior.

NORTH DAKOTA.

H. F. Irwin, Tioga.

OKLAHOMA.

Noah S. Costelou, Heavener.
Carlos C. Curtis, Cordell.
A. M. Myers, Lexington.

OREGON.

Reber G. Allen, Silverton.
Robert C. Mays, Elgin.
John M. Parry, Moro.
Andreas L. Sproul, Ontario.
James S. Van Winkle, Albany.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Ada U. Ashcom, Ligonier.
William A. Boyd, Sandy Lake.
William W. Wren, Boyertown.

RHODE ISLAND.

James T. Caswell, Narragansett Pier.
George E. Gardner, Wickford.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Charles H. Hicks, Laurens.

WASHINGTON.

Charles McKinnon, Black Diamond.
Daniel C. Pearson, Stanwood.
Fremont A. Tarr, Montesano.
Frank R. Wright, South Bend.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 14, 1911.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Rev. E. E. Marshall, pastor of North Capitol Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECONSIDERATION OF TWO SENATE BILLS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed two Senate bills under a misapprehension. A bill similar to one of them had already been passed by the House and sent to the Senate. The bills referred to are Senate bills 10410 and 10757. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bills were passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the two bills in question were passed. The Clerk will read the titles of the bills.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 10410) to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala.

A bill (S. 10757) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all action on the bills be canceled and that the bills be returned to the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the action taken on these bills as shown by the Journal be abrogated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if House bill 32216 is undisposed of on this legislative day, the House may proceed with its consideration to-morrow. I make that request with the acquiescence of gentlemen who are opposed to the bill as well as some who are in favor of it.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I object to that kind of an arrangement myself.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Chair is not sure that it can be dispensed with except by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I made a request last night for unanimous consent that all Members have leave to print on the pending bill, H. R. 32216, for five legislative days.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. From what time, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. McCALL. From the time the bill shall have been acted upon by the House; say five legislative days.

Mr. MANN. Was not that agreed to last night?

Mr. McCALL. No; it was objected to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] asks unanimous consent that all Members may have leave to print on the pending bill, H. R. 32216, for five legislative days from the time the bill shall have been acted upon by the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he make it a little longer than five days, because the bill may not pass for a day or two.

Mr. McCALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest seven legislative days instead of five.

Mr. OLCOTT. Why not say "to the end of the session?"

Mr. McCALL. I am willing to make it 10 days, unless there is objection.

The SPEAKER. Ten days is now suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. McCALL. I would modify my request and make it 10 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to extend the time for 10 legislative days after the bill is disposed of by the House, during which all Members of the House may print?

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I presume leave to print would be applicable only to Members asking leave to print and who would confine themselves to the discussion of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. No; it would apply to all.

Mr. McCALL. Every Member of the House on the pending bill.

Mr. BOEHNE. But to confine themselves to the pending bill?

Mr. McCALL. Yes; to the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at this time to move that on to-morrow we could not proceed with calendar Wednesday? And if that motion were carried by a two-thirds vote, should we be enabled to go on with this bill to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The question is whether we can do it at this time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

4. On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of Rule XXIV, unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine. On such a motion there may be debate not to exceed five minutes for and against.

The SPEAKER. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry, it seems to the Chair that sufficient unto the day is the evil or good thereof; and when to-morrow comes the House, under that rule, can take such action as it may see proper to take; but it occurs to the Chair that a stream can not be crossed until you come to it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. There was so much disturbance that I could not hear the words of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair it is not in order to-day, by unanimous agreement or by motion, to dispense with calendar Wednesday, which would be to-morrow.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate may be equally divided between the advocates and the opponents of the bill, and that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] control one half the time and I control the other.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 32216) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill indicated.

Mr. DWIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York suggests the absence of a quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 38, answered "present" 9, not voting 95, as follows:

YEAS—242.

Adair	Dodds	Johnson, Ky.	Plumley
Adamson	Douglas	Johnson, S. C.	Polindexter
Aiken	Draper	Jones	Pratt
Ames	Driscoll, D. A.	Kelher	Pray
Anderson	Dupre	Kendall	Pujo
Ansberry	Durey	Kennedy, Iowa	Raney
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ga.	Kennedy, Ohio	Randell, Tex.
Austin	Ellerbe	Kinkead, N. J.	Rauch
Barchfeld	Ellis	Kitchin	Reid
Barnard	Esch	Knapp	Richardson
Barnhart	Estopinal	Knowland	Roberts
Bartholdt	Ferris	Korby	Robinson
Bartlett, Ga.	Fish	Kuftermann	Roddenbery
Bartlett, Nev.	Fitzgerald	Lafan	Rodenberg
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Lamb	Rothermel
Bell, Ga.	Floyd, Ark.	Latta	Rucker, Colo.
Bingham	Fornes	Law	Rucker, Mo.
Boehne	Foss	Lawrence	Saunders
Booher	Foster, Ill.	Lee	Scott
Borland	Foster, Vt.	Legare	Shackelford
Boutell	Gaines	Lenroot	Sharp
Bowers	Gallagher	Lever	Sheffield
Brantley	Gardner, Mass.	Lindbergh	Sheppard
Burke, Pa.	Garner, Pa.	Lively	Sherley
Burleigh	Garner, Tex.	Livingston	Sherwood
Burleson	Garrett	Lloyd	Simmons
Burnett	Gillespie	Longworth	Sims
Butler	Glass	McCall	Sisson
Byrd	Godwin	McCreary	Slayden
Byrns	Goebel	McDermott	Slemp
Calder	Goldfogle	McHenry	Small
Candler	Gordon	McKinney	Smith, Iowa.
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Carlin	Greene	Madden	Sparkman
Cary	Gregg	Madison	Spight
Cassidy	Griest	Maguire, Nebr.	Stafford
Chapman	Guernsey	Mann	Stanley
Clark, Fla.	Hamer	Martin, Colo.	Stephens, Tex.
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Clayton	Hamlin	Massey	Stevens, Minn.
Cocks, N. Y.	Hardy	Mays	Sulloway
Conry	Havens	Miller, Kans.	Sulzer
Cooper, Pa.	Hay	Mitchell	Swasey
Cooper, Wis.	Hefflin	Moon, Pa.	Talbott
Covington	Helm	Moon, Tenn.	Tawney
Cox, Ind.	Henry, Conn.	Morehead	Taylor, Ala.
Cox, Ohio	Henry, Tex.	Morrison	Taylor, Ohio
Craig	Higgins	Moss	Thomas, Ky.
Cravens	Hill	Needham	Thomas, N. C.
Crow	Hitchcock	Nelson	Tilson
Crumppacker	Hollingsworth	Nicholls	Tou Velle
Cullop	Houston	Nye	Underwood
Dalzell	Howell, Utah	O'Connell	Wanger
Dawson	Howland	Oldfield	Watkins
Denby	Hubbard, Iowa	Olmsted	Welss
Dent	Hughes, Ga.	Page	Wiley
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Palmer, H. W.	Wilson, Ill.
Dickinson	Hull, Tenn.	Parker	Young, Mich.
Dickson, Miss.	Humphreys, Miss.	Parsons	Young, N. Y.
Dies	James	Pearre	
Dixon, Ind.	Jameson	Pickett	

NAYS—38.

Bennet, N. Y.	Fuller	Kopp	Olcott
Broussard	Gardner, N. J.	Langham	Prince
Burke, S. Dak.	Graham, Pa.	Loudenslager	Snapp
Campbell	Grant	McLaughlin, Mich.	Steenerson
Cowles	Hanna	Malby	Thistlewood
Creager	Haugen	Moore, Pa.	Thomas, Ohio
Davidson	Hayes	Morgan, Mo.	Volstead
Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Morgan, Okla.	Webb
Englebright	Johnson, Ohio	Moxley	
Fordney	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Norris	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Currier	Howell, N. J.	Padgett	Wallace
Good	Kelifer	Riordan	Woods, Iowa
Goulden			

NOT VOTING—95.

Alexander, Mo.	Finley	Kronmiller	Peters
Alexander, N. Y.	Focht	Langley	Pou
Allen	Foelker	Lindsay	Ransdell, La.
Andrus	Fowler	Loud	Reeder
Anthony	Gardner, Mich.	Lowden	Rhinoek
Barclay	Gill, Md.	Lundin	Sabath
Bates	Gill, Mo.	McCredie	Smith, Cal.
Bennett, Ky.	Gillett	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Graff	McKinlay, Cal.	Southwick
Burgess	Hamilton	McKinley, Ill.	Sperry
Calderhead	Hammond	McLachlan, Cal.	Sturgiss
Capron	Hardwick	McMorran	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Harrison	Maynard	Townsend
Cline	Hawley	Miller, Minn.	Turnbull
Cole	Heald	Millington	Vreeland
Collier	Hinshaw	Mondell	Washburn
Coudrey	Hobson	Moore, Tex.	Weeks
Davis	Howard	Morse	Wheeler
Diekema	Hubbard, W. Va.	Mudd	Wickliffe
Driscoll, M. E.	Huff	Murdock	Willett
Edwards, Ky.	Hughes, W. Va.	Murphy	Wilson, Pa.
Elvins	Hull, Iowa	Palmer, A. M.	Wood, N. J.
Fairchild	Joyce	Patterson	Woodyard
Fassett	Kahn	Payne	

So the motion was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. WOODS of Iowa with Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Until further notice:

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HARDWICK.

Mr. WOOD of New Jersey with Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. SMITH of California with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. PAYNE with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. HOBSON.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. MOORE of Texas.

Mr. MURDOCK with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. SPERRY with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. FOELKER with Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER.

Mr. BATES with Mr. GILL of Maryland.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. CLINE.

Mr. DAVIS with Mr. HAMMOND.

Mr. FASSETT with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. GILLET with Mr. POU.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. HEALD with Mr. TURNBULL.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. WICKLIFFE.

Mr. LOWDEN with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. CARTER.

On Canadian reciprocity:

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey (in favor) with Mr. McMOHRAN (against).

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL (in favor) with Mr. ALLEN (against).

Mr. LOUD with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, commencing Monday noon, ending Wednesday noon.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. GILL of Missouri, commencing Friday, ending Thursday noon.

Mr. JOYCE with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana, commencing February 10, ending February 18, inclusive.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia with Mr. SABATH, commencing February 10, ending February 20, inclusive.

Mr. DIEKEMA with Mr. PADGETT, commencing to-day, until further notice, on all questions except Canadian reciprocity.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, pending the announcement of the vote, I want to say that at half past 4 this afternoon I shall move that the committee rise, and, if the motion is agreed to, and we go into the House, I shall ask that debate be closed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FULLER). The gentleman will wait until we ascertain whether there is a quorum and proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I now give notice that at half past 4 I shall move that the committee rise, and if it so votes, I shall ask the House to vote to close general debate, and then for the committee to resume its session and take up the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. DALZIELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope that motion will not prevail. There are a number of gentlemen who desire to address the House.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not ask unanimous consent, but simply made an announcement.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MANN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 32216) to permit reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, the bill the House is now considering comes before us because the Payne bill failed in one of its important provisions. When the Payne bill was written a provision was included in it for a minimum and maximum tariff, with the understanding by the majority of the committee—certainly not of the minority—that the minimum and maximum clause would be used to adjust our trade relations with foreign countries. When it became necessary to put that provision into force the President was compelled under its provisions absolutely to lie down in his negotiations with the

balance of the world, accomplish nothing for our commerce, and surrender without conditions.

I believe in a maximum and minimum tariff, not a minimum and maximum tariff, such as the Payne law was written. In other words, when you wrote your tariff legislation and put it on the statute book and you said the bill as passed should be the minimum rate, the lowest rate, and that the maximum rate should be a 25 per cent increase for those nations who would not make concessions in favor of our trade, that means that you take the big stick and attempt to coerce the nations of the world to agree with your terms in reference to commercial pacts. It can not be done that way, as was proven by the French minimum and maximum tariff law passed 20 years before the Payne tariff law was put upon the books.

You would take the "big stick" and drive other nations into an agreement with you on commercial matters; and you can not, and you ought not to attempt to do it. It was for that reason that the entire minimum and maximum provisions of the Payne tariff bill proved to be a failure.

If the Payne tariff law, or some other tariff law, had been written and the law itself had been made a maximum rate, and a minimum rate provided by which you could make concessions to other nations, or by which other nations would make concessions to you, then we could have adjusted these trade differences without the necessity of making this trade pact that is pending before the House. We would have left the matter in the President's hands to get concessions for us by making reductions of the tariff taxes within the terms of the law.

But our Republican friends who wrote the Payne-Aldrich bill were so insistent that we should have a high tariff in this country and that no President, whoever he might be, should make any concessions from the high rates of taxation that they fixed that the President himself, under the law that he signed, has been driven to make a compact with Canada outside of the law to accomplish what was claimed could be accomplished when the law was originally written.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman says that he would have a maximum and minimum tariff, and his maximum tariff would be one that would apply unless the President could make agreements with nations so as to give them the benefit of the minimum tariff, as I understand it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. Then would his maximum tariff, which would be the ordinary tariff, be a protective tariff or a revenue tariff?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, a revenue tariff, of course.

Mr. GAINES. Then the gentleman would permit the Executive, and encourage the Executive, to make agreements letting in the products of the nation with which the agreement was made at rates even below the revenue tariff.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that there need be no misunderstanding between us. He would write a tariff with the element of protection in it and I would write a tariff without regard to protection whatever. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If there is any incidental protection that may grow out of a revenue bill, that is not a concern of ours; but we would write a tariff bill purely and solely for the purpose of raising the revenue that was necessary for the Government to have [applause on the Democratic side] to carry on the business of the Government.

Mr. GAINES. Just one more question, in order, as the gentleman says, that there may be no misunderstanding at all between him and me. He would write a tariff bill without any reference whatever to protection, and he would in that bill authorize the Executive to—and, as I say, from his language he feels that the executive department ought—to make agreements after that with nations, letting in their products at even a lower rate than the revenue rate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, there are many revenue rates. The proper revenue rate is a matter that depends upon the exigencies and necessities that the Government, not on a question of protection, and if the Government is willing to concede some of its revenue for the purpose of developing its commerce there is no reason why the President should not be willing to make reasonable concessions for that purpose.

Now as to the pact, the proposition that is pending before the House, the President of the United States found himself in this position when he signed the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. He had made a law by which no real reduction of taxes were made to the American people, by which the high protective tariff system of which they complain was maintained with all the world, and especially with Canada. He expected to take the "big stick" and make Canada concede certain trade agreements in reference to paper and wood pulp and other matters

that the people of the United States were interested in. He absolutely failed because the Canadian ministers told him that he could put in his maximum tariff rate if he desired, knowing that he dared not do it. If he had done so, he would have brought about a political revolution in this country, and he knew it. Now, the President, without warrant of law, has entered into an agreement with the Canadian Government, for what purpose? For the purpose of reducing taxes for the benefit of the American people. That is what this proposition is. It is not in the language that I would have written it, it is not in the language that many of you on this side of the House would have written it, but I want to say to you this, there is not one single item in this bill that does not reduce the taxes levied on the American people under the Payne law. The Members of this House on this side of the Chamber, both in this Chamber and before the American people last fall, repudiated the Payne-Aldrich law. They denounced it as unjust taxation. The opportunity has come to us to-day to reduce these taxes and reduce them on some of the necessities of life.

Can any man in this House who believes in the principle that no taxes should be raised except for the purpose of raising revenue and that when you levy those taxes they should be levied at the lowest rates that will produce the necessary revenue to run the Government, can he consistently, with the principles that he has maintained in this House and before the American people, vote against this bill or for any subterfuge that is intended to kill the purpose of the bill? [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the proposition that confronts this side of the House. Gentlemen say that you have reduced the taxes on the products that the farmer produces. So you have, but how many men on this side of the House have maintained on the stump during their entire political lives that a tax on raw cotton would mean nothing, would produce no revenue, and be only a subterfuge; that a tax on wheat, barley, and corn is no protection to the American farmer, and is merely placed there as a subterfuge to mislead him and lead him into a trap to vote for high protection on manufactured articles. That is the position we have always taken; that is the position we believe in, and to say now that to put an import tax on raw cotton would raise the price of cotton, when the world's market and competition in the world's market fixes the price of cotton, is absurd. To say we should put a tax of 25 cents, as the Aldrich-Payne bill does, on wheat, where a surplus of that product is raised in this country and a large surplus is sold in the markets of the world, for the purpose either of protecting the American farmers or to raise revenue is a ridiculous statement, for it would do neither. It is surely true that the tax placed on those commodities by the Aldrich-Payne bill is a mere subterfuge, not for the benefit of the American farmer, but placed there solely and only for the purpose of deceiving him and inducing him to vote for the high-protective system on everything that he buys. I have heard it suggested that amendments would be offered to this bill to put agricultural implements on the free list and to put meat on the free list, the statement being made that this bill puts the farmers' products on the free list and you should put on the free list what the farmer buys. My friends, if we did not need revenue that statement would be correct, but I will modify that statement to this extent: If the farmers' product is put on the free list because it will not produce revenue, we should put a tax on what the farmer buys only to the extent that the exigencies of the Government require us to raise revenue, and no higher. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it is only a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Alabama think the adoption of this law will reduce the cost of living?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I regret to say I do not think that the adoption of this bill will reduce the cost of living to the extent I would like to see it reduced.

Mr. MADDEN. Do you assume it would reduce it at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would to a small extent, and I hope hereafter—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not; the gentleman must excuse me. I am answering that question.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to ask one simple question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well—

Mr. MADDEN. If the cost of living is not reduced by the adoption of this bill, is a tariff on the farmers' product a subterfuge?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The cost of living immediately across the border may be reduced to a small extent. We can not look to each individual neighborhood, but as a whole. I do not be-

lieve—and I am candid enough to say—I do not believe the price of wheat will be lowered in this country by the passage of this bill, or the price of barley, or the price of corn. The reason why I am in favor of this bill above all other questions and all other reasons is that its passage will demonstrate to the farmers of America that they have been fooled by the Republicans when it has been contended that tariff taxes placed on products whose selling price was fixed in the markets of the world would benefit them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, as to agricultural machinery and meat. Of course I recognize that this bill is not properly balanced when you put cattle on the free list and leave a prohibitive tax on meat, as you do in this bill.

But I want to call your attention to this fact: Suppose you put meat coming from Canada on the free list, would you get any meat to the consumers in this country? Not at all. The Canadians do not produce enough meat for their own people. A little might come over the border here and there, but it would not affect the price of meat in this country.

If you want to reduce the taxes upon meat for the benefit of the American people, reduce the general tariff law—the Payne tariff law—when we get to it next year. Reduce or wipe out the prohibitive tax on meat and let meat come in from the Argentine and from countries that really produce a surplus of it and have it in the market to sell, and then you will accomplish a result beneficial to the consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As to agricultural machinery, I understand that some of our distinguished standpat Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means, in order to defeat this measure, proposed in the committee that we put an amendment on the bill, placing agricultural machinery on the free list. I am glad to say that the Democratic members of that committee were not fooled by any such subterfuge, and stood for the measure without amendment, because it was for the benefit of the American people, and an amendment would destroy the agreement with Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, suppose you put agricultural machinery on the free list coming from Canada. The only manufacturers of agricultural machinery in Canada to-day are American manufacturers. The great trust that controls the manufacture of agricultural machinery in this country has reached out its arms and planted its factories in Canada. Most of the factories in that country that produce agricultural implements are in the control of the American trust. Now, tell me, my friends, how much you will accomplish for the American farmer by endangering the passage of this bill in attempting to put on the free list agricultural machinery coming from Canada?

Mr. KITCHIN. Is it not a fact that we ship into Canada and pay a tariff on more than a hundred times more agricultural implements than Canada ships into this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely. The real competition in agricultural implements comes from England and Germany. We are to-day shipping large quantities of agricultural implements to Canada and paying a differential tariff of one-third more than our English competitors are in that market, and beating them at their own game. When we can do that, do you think that making free trade on agricultural implements between the United States and Canada would affect the price of an agricultural implement in this country to a single farmer? You know it would not and is intended for no other purpose than to defeat a bill that reduces the taxes levied on the American people.

Now, when the proper time comes, when a Democratic Congress is assembled, when a Democratic Ways and Means Committee can present a bill, then I say to this House that the American farmer will receive what is just and right [applause on the Democratic side]; that we will not attempt to mislead him by putting agricultural implements on the free list from Canada; we will either put them on the free list or at a low revenue tariff coming from England and Germany, as well as the rest of the world, where there can be real competition, and so the American farmer can get some reduction of the price of farming machinery out of the measure.

Now, that being the case, I say to you Democrats who are worthy of the name, you men who are willing to stand for a cause that you believe is the cause of the people, let that side of the House throw these amendments at you, if they want to do so, but it is for you to stand here like honest Representatives of the people and support the bill without amendment. Do not think for a minute that your constituency have not the brains to understand this situation. If they offer these amendments to defeat a bill that we believe is right, as far as it goes, let us stand as one man and vote them down [applause on the Democratic side], with the distinct understanding in the

country that within a year the great Democratic Party will be in action in this House [applause on the Democratic side] and will be prepared to carry out its pledges to the people and will be able to do ample justice to the farmer as well as to the great body of the American people.

Therefore I appeal to you that when this bill is considered under the five-minute rule, as it must be to-night, do not let the column that the American people are depending on on this side of the House be broken, but stand as men and true Representatives of your constituencies, and put this bill through without an amendment, for an amendment means the defeat of a just measure; and the people will say that we have been true to our principles and true to our pledges. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 10583. An act to amend the charter of the Firemen's Insurance Co. of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia; and

S. 10632. An act to authorize the North Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Delaware & Bound Brook Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Delaware River from Lower Makefield Township, Bucks County, Pa., to Ewing Township, Mercer County, N. J.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 10632. An act to authorize the North Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Delaware & Bound Brook Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Delaware River, from Lower Makefield Township, Bucks County, Pa., to Ewing Township, Mercer County, N. J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 31538. An act to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala.;

H. R. 31860. An act permitting the building of a wagon and trolley-car bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; and

H. R. 31922. An act to authorize the Virginia Iron, Coal & Coke Co. to build a dam across the New River near Foster Falls, Wythe County, Va.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, in the observations that I shall make upon the pending measure I shall not undertake to go into details. I shall not attempt to sort out the various items of the several schedules and estimate how much we shall gain or lose in any particular item. I shall not discuss free pulp, free wood, free paper, free lumber, or the fisheries question. It will be my purpose rather to treat the question upon broad general principles and their relation to our policies, past, present, and future.

To my mind the question involved is more important than any question with which Congress has been called upon to deal for many years [applause on the Republican side], except, perhaps, in the case of the general revision of the tariff.

It is for that reason a matter of sincere regret that we are forced to its consideration with undue haste and without any information upon many matters of vital importance with respect to it. Why were these particular items included in these schedules, and not other items of the tariff bill selected as the subjects of legislation? We do not know and we have not been told. What effect will this discriminatory treaty with Canada have on our commercial relations with other nations with whom we have entered into treaty negotiations? We do not know, and no opinion has been vouchsafed to us from anyone competent to speak. Not only is this a misfortune as far as the committee that ought to have carefully considered this bill is concerned, but it is a misfortune so far as the public are concerned.

The unreasonable prejudice against the Payne tariff bill was created and fomented by the newspaper greed for free paper. That newspaper greed for free paper is behind this free-trade movement. [Applause on the Republican side.] The opponents of this measure have no forum in which they can be heard, and so the public are kept in ignorance of the facts, and a false sentiment is created in favor of newspaper interests.

Up to the time the President's message informed Congress that he had entered into a trade agreement with Canada, the House of Representatives, where all bills raising revenue must originate under the Constitution, knew nothing at all about it. It is safe to say that no Member of Congress had been consulted either about the project or about its details. On January 28, two days after the message, a bill drawn in the State Department—the bill now pending, with a material amendment—was presented in the House. On January 31 it was unanimously adopted at a caucus of the Democratic Party in this House. [Applause on the Republican side.] After less than a week of hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill was forced to a vote. Amendments submitted by the administration were admitted; all other amendments were denied consideration, and within two days the bill was reported to the House.

By the terms of the bill four general classes of products are affected: First, leading food and agricultural products, rough lumber, some raw materials and print paper, and all these are put on the free list; second, secondary food products, such as fresh and canned meats, flour, and partly manufactured food products, on which rates are reduced and made identical; third, manufactured commodities, such as motor vehicles, cutlery, sanitary fixtures, and miscellaneous articles, on which the rates are mutually reduced; fourth, a small list of articles on which special rates are given by each country. Canada reduces the duty on coal and cement, and the United States reduces the duty on iron ore and aluminum.

The bill involves a revision of our tariff law. It involves millions of our national revenue. It involves our commercial relations with other nations. And yet it comes here to be voted on after a week's consideration in committee.

We protest against its passage for the following, amongst other reasons: First, it involves a trade agreement with Canada similar to the one that existed heretofore from 1854 to 1866, and the operation of which proved disastrous to the United States. As a business proposition it is wholly indefensible. Advantage under it accrues to Canada without any corresponding advantage to the United States. It is uncalled for by the great body of our people.

Second, it is un-Republican. It proposes reciprocity in competing products, which is absolutely inconsistent with the policy of protection. It is an abandonment of the protective policy and an espousal of the doctrine of free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is in violation of the history, the traditions, and the pledges of 50 years of our Republican platforms. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Third, it is class legislation of the most obnoxious character. It selects from all the classes of the community the farmer and deprives him of the protection accorded to all other classes. It compels him to produce in a free-trade market and to buy in a protected market. It is in the interest of the foreigner and against the American.

The same undue haste that has prevailed with us seems to have prevailed also in the Canadian Parliament. The press report says that at the opening session a French conservative nationalist attempted to defer the discussion. J. D. Monk declared there had not been enough time for proper study of so large a question, and moved an amendment regretting that the measure was being submitted without proper consideration. For the Government, Mr. Fielding replied that the question was not new, and there had been no undue haste in its presentation.

It is the reciprocity agreement of 1854 over again, with comparatively little change—

He said.

It promises prosperity to the people of Canada, and this house would make a grave mistake and do a grave wrong if it refused to take advantage of it.

An examination of the provisions of this bill and of the terms of the treaty of 1854 will confirm Mr. Fielding's statement that the two are substantially the same. There is this difference, however, that under the treaty of 1854 we obtained something in the shape of fisheries concessions, while under the present proposed treaty we obtain nothing.

There was a reason for the making of the treaty of 1854, while at the present time no reason exists for the making of any such treaty.

I read from what Mr. Blaine said in his book, *Twenty Years in Congress*, relative to the making and the effect of the treaty of 1854:

On the 20th of October, 1818, a treaty was concluded at London containing as its first and most important provision an absolute surrender of some of our most valuable rights in the fisheries.

From the execution of this treaty—as might have been seen—the misunderstanding between the two countries in relation to the fisheries became more complicated.

The right in the fisheries conceded by the treaty of 1854—originally ours under the treaty of 1782, and unnecessarily and unwisely renounced in the treaty of 1818—was not given freely, but in consideration of a great price. That price was reciprocity of trade, so called, between the United States and the British North American Provinces in certain commodities named in the treaty. The selection, as shown by the schedule, was made almost wholly to favor Canadian interests. There was scarcely a product in the list which could be exported from the United States to Canada without loss, while the great market of the United States was thrown open to Canada without tax or charge for nearly everything which she could produce and export. All her raw materials were admitted free, while all our manufactures were charged with heavy duty, the market being reserved for English merchants. The fishery question had been adroitly used to secure from the United States an agreement which was one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable. It had served its purpose admirably as a makeweight for Canada in acquiring the most generous and profitable market she ever enjoyed for her products.

The correctness of Mr. Blaine's declaration that the treaty was vexatious, one-sided, and unprofitable appears from the fact that in the last year and three-quarters of its life we remitted to Canada duties amounting to \$70,152,163, and the balance of trade was against us in the sum of over \$28,000,000.

Senator Morrill, of Vermont, who was thoroughly competent to speak upon this subject, said with respect to the results of that treaty:

Our exports to Canada in 1855 were \$20,828,676, but under the operation of reciprocity, then commenced, they dwindled in 12 years down to \$15,243,834, while the exports of Canada to the United States increased from \$12,000,000 and odd to \$46,000,000 and odd. When the treaty began the balance of trade had been \$8,000,000 annually in our favor and that paid in specie, but at the end the balance against us to be paid in specie in a single year was \$30,000,000. Here was a positive yearly loss of over \$5,000,000 of our export trade and a loss of \$38,000,000 specie, all going to enrich the Canadians at our expense.

The treaty was denounced by Congress in 1865, and if I had the time I could cite to you the names, all along the line, of distinguished American statesmen who declared that this treaty had been against the interests of the United States and altogether to the advantage of Canada.

The first Republican leader who is recorded as having expressed an opinion on the subject of this treaty seems to have been the great Massachusetts Senator, Charles Sumner. He was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate and reported the joint resolution for denouncing the treaty. On this occasion Mr. Sumner argued that the event had shown that the treaty was much more advantageous to Canada than to the United States; that, in short, it was unilateral and hence not reciprocal. He went on to say:

The reciprocity treaty has a beautiful name. It suggests at once exchange, equality, equity; and it is because it was supposed to advance those ideas practically that this treaty was originally accepted by the people of the United States.

And following on that declaration by Mr. Sumner comes the same opinion out of the mouths of Mr. Sherman of Ohio, Mr. Collamer and Mr. Foote of Vermont, Mr. Morrill of Maine, Mr. Chandler of Michigan, Mr. Doolittle of Wisconsin, Mr. Wilson of Massachusetts, and many others.

I take it to be clear, therefore, as a matter of history that the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with Canada resulted to the great disadvantage of the United States, and that if we should be guided by our experience on that occasion we should refuse now to enact into law almost the same treaty—substantially the same treaty, so far as results would be concerned.

The treaty was denounced, as I have stated, in 1865, and then what happened? No sooner were we released from its obnoxious and unprofitable terms than our commerce with Canada resumed its normal conditions. The results are well set forth in an article in the *North American Review* of February, 1904, which was written by Sir John Charlton, a member of the Canadian Parliament, and to which I desire to call your attention:

The nonprogressive character of the Canadian export trade to the United States is shown by the fact that, while the export in 1866 amounted to \$44,000,000, the export in 1903, less precious metals and articles not the produce of Canada, was no more than \$48,959,000. On the other hand, a comparison of Canadian import returns from the United States will show remarkable increase, as the subjoined table will demonstrate.

Now mark these figures, the figures following upon the denunciation of the treaty of 1854:

Canadian imports from the United States for consumption.	
1866	\$28,794,000
1890	52,291,000
1896	54,574,000
1900	109,844,000
1901	110,485,000
1902	120,814,000
1903	137,600,000

These are imports from the United States into Canada for consumption, the goods which we sold her, and for which we got pay. Here is another branch of the same subject from Mr. Charlton's magazine article:

The subjoined table, showing the Canadian importation of manufactures from Great Britain and from the United States since 1898, will be of interest, especially when taken in connection with the fact that Canada has given a tariff preference to Great Britain, first of 12½ per cent, 1897 to 1898, then of 25 per cent to 1900, and of 33½ per cent since that time.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Surely.

Mr. HARRISON. In discussing the effect of the reciprocity of 1854 does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania leave out of account the fact that during that period a great war raged in the United States for four years, which paralyzed our industries?

Mr. DALZELL. No; I do not leave that out of consideration at all. The war had but little to do with it. I propose to show that under the treaty of 1854 everything resulted to the disadvantage of the United States, and that the moment the treaty of 1854 was denounced everything, down to the present day, has resulted to the advantage of the United States, and that there not only now exists no reason why this reciprocity treaty should be enacted, but that it would be to our great disadvantage to open the markets of the United States to the markets of Canada.

Now, to come back again to Mr. Charlton. These are the Canadian imports of manufactures:

Canadian imports of manufactures.

Years.	From Great Britain.	From United States.
1898.....	\$26,243,000	\$41,510,000
1899.....	31,187,000	49,362,000
1900.....	37,328,000	60,473,000
1901.....	36,469,000	62,643,000
1902.....	41,675,000	69,536,000
1903.....	50,473,000	76,291,000

In 1903 the imports from Great Britain were \$50,000,000 and from the United States \$76,000,000.

Then I go on with Mr. Charlton:

This great increase in the sale of manufactures by the United States to Canada between 1898 and 1903, in the face of the Canadian preference in favor of British imports, gives evidence of the strong hold that the American manufacturer has upon the Canadian market and of his ability to meet all competitors in the market upon equal terms.

Now let me add to Mr. Charlton's figures in respect to the manufactures in Great Britain, so as to bring them down to date:

Manufactures imported for consumption into Canada from the United States and the United Kingdom.

Years.	From United States.	From United Kingdom.
1904.....	\$81,108,154	\$51,207,758
1905.....	89,113,337	49,743,726
1906.....	100,246,392	57,232,427
1907.....	88,541,601	54,316,829
1908.....	116,577,079	82,249,276
1909.....	93,723,441	60,175,413
1910.....	(¹)	(¹)

¹ No data.

Furthermore, our exports to Canada last year were \$241,809,233, and our imports from Canada were \$103,256,955; or in other words, in the present condition of our commercial relations with Canada, the balance of trade in our favor last year was \$138,552,278, or 134.20 per cent, of exports over imports. Our exports to all other countries were \$1,622,682,411, and our imports were \$1,459,667,296, the balance of trade in our favor being \$163,015,115, or 11.17 per cent, of exports over imports in our world's trade, as against 134.20 per cent in our trade with Canada. The balance of trade in our favor last year, to repeat, was \$138,000,000 and odd.

Now I want to show you why this was so, from the standpoint of the Canadian statesman. On the 24th of February, 1903, Mr. Charlton made a speech in the Canadian Parliament on the subject of reciprocity with the United States, in which he showed how favorable existing trade conditions were to the United States in its trade with Canada. He gives us credit for our business policy. He said:

The American policy has been applied not only to us but to all the world. The object of the United States has been to sell all that it possibly could of the products of its soil and its mills and its workshops and to buy just as little as it could from other countries, and

thus have as much of the balance of trade in its own favor as possible. The result has been that the balance of trade in favor of the United States last year amounted to \$600,000,000 as against the whole world, \$71,000,000 as against Canada. That is a good thing for the United States, and it will be her policy so long as the rest of the whole world will permit her to do it; but it is not good for us.

Then he goes on to say further:

Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than she has already made. We can not afford any more.

Mr. Chairman, what is the situation? Every word spoken by Mr. Charlton in 1903 is as true to-day as it was then. The United States is pursuing to-day the same wise policy that it pursued then, in pursuance of which policy our trade with Canada increases year by year and the balance of trade remains in favor of our own citizens.

From all sides evidence of the present satisfactory character of our Canadian trade accumulates.

The President tells us in his message that the entire foreign trade of Canada in the last fiscal year 1910 was \$655,000,000, that her imports were \$376,000,000, and adds, "Of this amount the United States contributed \$223,000,000."

The Committee on Ways and Means in reporting this bill to the House, says:

Our splendid trade with the German Empire takes only \$258,000,000 of our exports each year as compared with \$242,000,000 which we sell to Canada. France buys from us annually only \$54,000,000; the United Kingdom only \$307,000,000.

These last figures are exclusive of cotton exports.

In all our world commerce we have no trade relations that display such gratifying conditions as are displayed in our existing trade with Canada—everything there is going our way.

Is it not an astounding proposition that we shall legislate away our advantages in the interest of the Canadians? Yet that will be the result of the passage of the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. No concealment is made of the fact that we propose to give away \$5,000,000 a year revenue in return for two millions and a half of Canadian revenue. In other words, we propose to trade a good American dollar for a Canadian half dollar. We propose to throw open the markets, the splendid markets, of 90,000,000 of prosperous people to the meager markets of less than 9,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why, the proposition is so astounding that it staggers belief.

Mr. Chairman, I have not the time or I might go on to show how during every administration since the administration of Gen. Grant, during every administration since the denouncement of the treaty of 1854, Canada has been knocking at our doors, asking for a renewal of that treaty.

In all cases the opinion was expressed that our experience of a reciprocity trade in noncompeting articles with Canada had cost us millions of money and that so long as our trade was prosperous as it is it would be unwise, unbusinesslike, foolish to the utmost degree, to renew any such treaty.

In his first annual message to Congress, under date of December 6, 1869, President Grant alluded to the Canada treaty in terms of disapproval on account of its lack of true reciprocity. I quote this extract from his message:

The question of renewing a treaty for reciprocal trade between the United States and the British Provinces on this continent has not been favorably considered by the administration. The advantages of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producer. Except possibly a few engaged in the trade between the two sections, no citizen of the United States would be benefited by reciprocity. Our internal taxation would prove a protection to the British producer almost equal to the protection which our manufacturers now receive from the tariff. Some arrangement, however, for the regulation of commercial intercourse between the United States and the Dominion of Canada may be desirable.

President Grant, in his second administration, assisted by his Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, made an effort to perfect a new reciprocity treaty with Canada, embracing, among other items, the admission into Canada of a large number of our manufactured articles free of duty. The treaty miscarried, as did all other subsequent tentative treaties with Canada, the prevailing idea in opposition thereto apparently having always been that the productions of Canada were practically identical with our own productions, and hence any general admission of Canadian products into this country free of duty or at reduced rates of duty would necessarily compete injuriously with our own industries.

President Harrison, in his message of June 20, 1892, said:

A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products (referring to the case of Canada) would have been such only in form. The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government. A treaty that should be reciprocal in fact and of mutual advantages must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles and have secured to the United States a free

or favored introduction of these articles into Canada as against the world.

And again, in his fourth annual message, Mr. Harrison said:

During the past year a suggestion was received through the British minister that the Canadian Government would like to confer as to the possibility of enlarging, upon terms of mutual advantage, the commercial exchanges of Canada and of the United States; and a conference was held at Washington, with Mr. Blaine acting for this Government and the British minister at this capital and three members of the Dominion cabinet acting as commissioners on the part of Great Britain. The conference developed the fact that the Canadian Government was only prepared to offer to the United States, in exchange for the concessions asked, the admission of natural products. The statement was frankly made that favored rates could not be given to the United States as against the mother country. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I pass to my next proposition. This bill is un-Republican. Reciprocity in competitive articles is inconsistent with the policy of protection. It is too manifest to be the subject of argument that to impose a duty on a foreign article for the purpose of preserving the home market for a like home article, and then to lower or remove that duty so as to admit the foreign article into competition in the home market, is to abandon in that case the policy of protection and to adopt that of free trade. Every duty imposed by the existing tariff law of less than two years ago on the articles of the agricultural schedule was imposed for the purpose of preserving the American market for the American as against the Canadian farmer. To remove those duties now and let in the Canadian farmer is to abandon protection—the protection declared in the Payne bill—and to adopt free trade. Reciprocity of that character, if it can be called reciprocity at all, is Democratic reciprocity and not Republican reciprocity. [Applause on the Republican side.] I recall an article published in a magazine a few years ago, by Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, then a Member of the House, now a Senator-elect from the State of Mississippi, in which he said:

There is also a tariff revision by piecemeal which is the handmaiden of the other system. This is the tariff revision by reciprocal trade agreements with other nations. Much can be done along this piecemeal line of tariff revision under a Democratic or approximately Democratic law.

Is it any wonder that on this bill coming into the House the Democrats on the other side of the aisle rose up and indorsed it? Why, they were shrewd enough to recognize their own. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Republican reciprocity is reciprocity in noncompetitive articles and in nothing else. The late ex-Postmaster General, Charles Emory Smith, thus defined it:

When rightly understood the principle is axiomatic. Brazil grows coffee but makes no machinery. We make machinery but grow no coffee. She needs the fabrics of our factories and forges and we need the fruits of her tropical soil. We agree to concessions for her coffee, she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity.

And I know of no better definition for this purpose than that given by President McKinley in his inaugural address in 1897:

The end in view always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor of our own people, but tend to increase their prosperity.

I have no doubt that at some time further on in this debate the sacred name of William McKinley will be called upon in indorsement of this reciprocity agreement. I affirm, and I challenge successful contradiction, that William McKinley never in all his life uttered a syllable that can be construed into an indorsement of any other reciprocity than reciprocity in non-competing articles. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. From my standpoint there is no such thing as reciprocity in noncompetitive articles. The Republican doctrine is—

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I can not yield for a speech, my friend.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The Republican doctrine is to put everything on the free list which we do not manufacture ourselves. Consequently there is no need of reciprocity in noncompetitive articles. Reciprocity means give and take; it means something that we can concede to others and for which they can concede—

Mr. DALZELL. That is just what I have been reading to the gentleman. That is McKinley reciprocity; that is Blaine reciprocity; that is Republican reciprocity; a reciprocity which is not a violation of the principle of protection. Now, let me go on—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that under the McKinley Act 14 such reciprocity treaties in noncompetitive articles were drawn up and ratified and they were swept away by the Wilson Act of 1894?

Mr. DALZELL. I will say to the gentleman in reply, that in the McKinley Act for the first time a reciprocity arrangement was put into a tariff law, and that reciprocity arrangement was suggested, in the first instance, by Mr. Blaine and perfected, after mature deliberation, by President Harrison. It consisted of putting duties upon those things that otherwise would remain upon the free list, so as to compel fair recognition of us upon the part of those who raised the articles that otherwise would be on the free list. That is Blaine reciprocity; that is McKinley reciprocity; that is Republican reciprocity; and it is the exact opposite and a contradiction of the reciprocity in competitive articles that is embodied in this bill.

Coming back to Mr. McKinley's definition, this proposition involves the granting of concessions to the products of Canada, which we do not need and which we can produce ourselves, and which involves a loss of labor to our farmers. It is Democratic, not Republican, reciprocity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The subject of Republican reciprocity and what it is and what it is not was much discussed during the consideration of the McKinley bill. When the bill went from the House to the Senate it did not contain the reciprocity provisions which were in it when it became a law. Mr. Blaine contended, if I may repeat myself, that we should secure an advantage by imposing duties on articles on the free list unless the producers of those articles should grant reasonable concessions to us.

The matter was finally adjusted by providing for the suspension of free introduction of certain tropical products whenever the President should find that our goods were unjustly dealt with by the countries sending us such products. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has said, pursuant to the authority given to the President in that tariff law 14 such reciprocity agreements were made, and they were in successful operation, bringing revenue to the United States Federal Treasury, when with one fell swoop they were all cast aside by the provisions of the Wilson-Gorman tariff law. [Applause.]

Now, I want to quote to you as confirmatory of what I have said as to what Republican reciprocity is and what it is not the opinions of some of the distinguished statesmen who expressed themselves upon that question at the time of the making of the McKinley bill.

Senator Spooner said:

I am in favor of protecting, as we are doing by this bill, our home industries and caring for the well-being of our neighbor and developing the home market for our products; and with the surplus products of farm and factory and mine for which we have no market I would trade with any government under the shining sun for those things which they produce that we want and which we do not produce. It need not be confined to Latin America either this reciprocity for which I am willing to vote.

And the venerable Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] said:

I am in favor of such reciprocity between the United States and other nations, especially with the Republics of Mexico and Central and South America, as can be agreed upon and as will open up new markets to the people of this country.

What we desire is to find a market for whatever surplus we may have, either in agricultural productions or in manufactures; and to secure such markets we should be willing to take from the people who take our surplus a sufficient amount of the surplus of such products or articles as we do not produce to the extent of our needs to pay for it.

And the venerable Senator from Vermont, Senator Morrill, who for many years stood, and stood to the day of his death, as an advocate of protection, said:

The Canadian reciprocity treaty demonstrated the profitlessness of reciprocity treaties with countries whose products of exchange are chiefly agricultural and which we do not want.

Now, to reduce to definite terms the results of all these expressions of opinion on the subject, I say that Republican reciprocity means, first, the products admitted to the United States must not compete with ours; second, the Government traded with must be such as would take our surplus of manufactures and of farm productions; third, the concessions maintained by us must be fully equivalent in the volume of trade thereby gained, to those made by the countries with which the arrangements were entered into.

And I affirm that every Republican platform since 1892, when it undertook to define reciprocity, has defined Republican reciprocity in exact accordance with the terms that I have just laid down.

Republican reciprocity was indorsed in the Republican platform at the convention of 1892:

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the last Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which can not be

produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the product of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

We assert that the prices of manufactured articles of general consumption have been reduced under the operations of the tariff act of 1890.

We point to the success of Republican policy of reciprocity under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party to this practical business measure and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

Again, in 1896:

We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry; it puts the burden of revenue on foreign goods; it secures the American market for the American producer; it upholds the American standard of wages for the American workingman; it puts the factory by the side of the farm; it makes the American farmer less dependent on foreign demand and price; it diffuses general thrift, and founds the strength of all on the strength of each. In its reasonable application it is just, fair, and impartial, equally opposed to foreign control and domestic monopoly, to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism.

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure enlarged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both and both must be reestablished—protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessities of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interest which gain open markets for us in return for our open market for others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.

Again, in 1900:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

Again, in 1904:

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

There is nothing in the history of the Republican party, nothing in its traditions, nothing in its platforms, that justifies the claim that reciprocity in competing products is consistent with the Republican doctrine of protection. On the contrary, everything in its history, everything in its traditions, everything in its platforms, conforms to the idea and proclaims such reciprocity to be inconsistent with the protective system, and therefore inconsistent with Republicanism. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague pardon a brief question?

Mr. DALZELL. Sure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of course I presume that the gentleman assumes that there is no article grown or produced in Canada that is not also grown or produced in this country, and that therefore, according to his theory, there can be no such thing as reciprocity with Canada. Am I correct in stating that?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; substantially so.

Mr. FASSETT. It would be freer trade.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I pass briefly to my third proposition. This bill is class legislation of the most obnoxious character. It seeks out from the beneficiaries of the tariff the farmer. Everything he produces is put on the free list. Everything he buys is a protected article. His corn, his wheat, his potatoes, his hay, his oats, his live stock, are all put on the free list. His reaper, his harrow, his plow, his farm implements, are all taxed. Everything in the shape of meats and foods of all kinds are on the dutiable list. True, farm products are made interchangeably free between the United States and Canada, but every sane man knows that this is intended, not to open up the Canadian market to the United States farmer, but to open up the United States market to the Canadian farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And the United States farmer is to get nothing. The supposed benefits which are to accrue, for which he pays, are in the shape of new markets for the manufacturer. There are only two American manufactures of any consequence involved in this agreement, that of the paper manufacturer, whose interests are absolutely sacrificed, and that of the Harvester Trust, which has a factory in Canada to supply its own customers.

The American manufacturer in general needs but little lowering of duties in order to enter the Canadian market. The

Canadian is naturally—and could not, if he would, avoid being—to a large extent our customer. The trade statistics that I have already cited furnish conclusive proof to that effect. Every tariff law of either party for the past 50 years has recognized the farmers' right to protection as equal with that of every other class. Less than two years ago the present tariff law was made, in which he is given protection.

Some of the men who are now advocating this measure placed the duties in that bill on the farmers' products to protect the farmer against his Canadian neighbor. That law was pronounced by the President of the United States the best tariff law ever placed on the Statute Book. In what respect has the farmer's condition changed in these two years or less? How comes it that he is less entitled to protection now than then? Is there any reason for concealment? Is it worth while to attempt to deny that this is an abandonment of the policy of protection? It seems not. When the President's message was sent to Congress this manifest sacrifice of American interests was sought to be justified on lofty philanthropic grounds: Good will to our struggling neighbor, of the same language and traditions and all that sort of thing, a fantastic combination of altruism and revenue.

Now, however, the advocates of this measure find themselves driven by the logic of the situation to confess that this is free trade, and that it was intended to be, so far as it could be secured, and that it ought to be free trade altogether.

A new definition is sought to be given to the term "protection." It is said not to apply as between parties whose production is substantially similar, and then it is asserted that Canadian production and American production are substantially the same as to cost.

The assertion is not borne out by the facts. The average of Canadian wages is below the average of American wages. The value of Canadian lands is below the value of American lands. The Canadian gets his raw materials from abroad at a lower import duty than does the American. He prefers others to us at the customhouse. The Canadian manufacturer of metals is paid a bounty. An exhaustive examination by the Mann committee into the pulp and paper question demonstrated that by reason of lower wage rate Canada can make paper \$2 a ton cheaper than we can. The same conditions that relate to wage rates in paper manufacture prevail all along the line.

Because the American press, the most comprehensive, greedy, and unscrupulous monopoly when its interests are involved [applause], is for this measure and will not give the other side a hearing, the great public is being kept in ignorance of the real merits of the case and being deceived into favoring it. But the farmer is not deceived. He is more than ten millions strong. He will have a hearing when the polls open. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have shown that this measure is an unwise business measure. I have shown you years of disaster under a Canadian reciprocity agreement, and after its denunciation succeeding years of great prosperity down to this blessed day. I have shown you that this measure is un-Republican; that it violates the principles of the Republican Party; that it abandons protection and espouses free trade. It is a violation of the pledge of every Republican platform for the last 50 years of our history. [Applause.] I have shown you that this measure is obnoxious class legislation, that it sacrifices the farmer, the bone and sinew of the Republic, and destroys his interests. And now I fain would appeal to party loyalty, but I know it is of no use. The Republican protectionist, when this vote is taken, marches to his doom. He can not resist a united Democratic Party and such Republicans as hear from somewhere else an appeal louder than the appeal of party loyalty. United, together they will march to victory under Democratic leadership under the folds of the Democratic free-trade flag. I decline to follow. I shall stand where I have always stood, and go down with my party. [Applause.]

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on this proposition there can be no middle ground. On one side or the other every Representative must stand or fall. It suggests many questions and varying answers. Many of the questions are perplexing and many of the replies are convincing, while others are merely confusing. The latter we must discard in the presence of our duty to act without delay. Postponement will add more to the academic than to the practical questions, and there can be little justification for delaying action on the theory that time alone will dispel doubt.

Nothing short of a practical test will do that, and as the test can not come too soon for the American people, I am prepared to act and gratified at the opportunity to promptly perfect this legislation which concerns the welfare of a hundred million people.

The suggestion that because practically all the Democrats propose to vote for it I should vote against it is too shallow a sophistry to have the slightest influence with any sensible man. It is quite as possible for a majority of the Democrats to do the wise thing as it is for a minority of the Republicans to do the unwise thing. The world has never known any individual or set of individuals absolutely free from error. In the honest differences of opinion that arise from this discussion, able men who have heretofore agreed on party policies will be found on opposite sides, but the right to differ with each other on great public questions is one of the inherent virtues of our institutions.

Out of the discordant elements of nature comes the harmony of the universe, and out of the differences arising among us to-day will come that serene and sensible blending of effort which is constantly adding to the sentimental and substantial growth of the American people.

The basis of this legislation is an agreement worked out by able representatives selected by two great Nations. Six hundred items are affected, and it is only fair to assume that those who sat on both sides of the counsel table did their utmost to guard the interests of their respective countries and promote the mutual interests of both.

This proposition is opposed, first, by the Union Press of Great Britain; by those who would make Canada commercially as well as politically subservient to Great Britain, if it were in their power, and who would discourage by every possible effort, for selfish reasons, the commercial union of the United States and her sister Nation on the north.

As between the wishes of England, on the one hand, and the United States and Canada on the other, I am for our own people.

It is opposed by a few people in Canada, who suggest that it must be unfair to them because "it was made in the United States." The unsoundness of this objection is so apparent that I am again relieved of difficulty in taking my position.

It is opposed, again, by those who "view with alarm" the attempt of the executive branch of the Government at any time to lay its hand upon the so-called sacred schedules of the tariff.

For my part I can see no reason why broad-minded statesmen in any branch of the Government should not bring about results through trade agreements or treaties that will add to the general welfare of the Nation. In fact, if they failed to do it when the opportunity presented they would be derelict in their duty.

It is opposed by those who would profit by charging excessive prices for the necessities of life, and as between those and the great army of consumers in this country my labors shall be in defense of the latter.

It is opposed by those who by reason of contracted markets are enabled to speculate in the necessities of life and create corners in those articles for which there is a demand in every American home. As between these speculators on the one hand and the millions of men, women, and children who are compelled to eat and necessarily compelled to buy, I can find only one place in the battle and that is in defense of the latter.

It is opposed by those who say that it is not Republican, but Democratic in its character. As for this I am frightened by no such ghosts, for they no longer give alarm to full-grown men. As for its Republicanism it can not be questioned. It is not a new idea. Its history discloses a striking combination of coincidences. In searching for the sponsors of the principle it involves we find them in the persons of two Republican Presidents from the State of Ohio and two Secretaries of State born in Brownsville, Pa.

It is opposed also by those who fear that the modification of these schedules with reference to the necessities of life will be followed later on by an attack upon the schedules that protect our manufactured articles. My answer to that is, the propositions involved are entirely different. Different conditions obtain and substantial causes exist for the maintenance of the one that do not justify the maintenance of the other.

As a further answer, however, I may say that if the schedules protecting our manufactured articles have no more right to exist than the schedules relating to the necessities of life which we seek to modify between the United States and Canada, then I would just as willingly strike them from the statute book as I would those sought to be modified to-day.

If my support of this measure imperils my position as a Republican, I am perfectly willing to stand with William McKinley and William Howard Taft, of Ohio, and James G. Blaine and Philander C. Knox, who were born on the banks of the Monongahela, in western Pennsylvania.

As a Republican and a protectionist I shall always vote for any measure necessary to protect our industries against any

handicap arising out of a substantial difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, but in doing this I do not regard myself as forbidden to break down every barrier or unnecessary obstruction that has been erected to restrain the desire of an enlightened and industrious neighboring people, with common instincts and common purposes and similar conditions as to labor, to exchange their products with each other.

Wherever and whenever I can properly lower the cost of the necessities of life without destroying an American industry, I shall do so.

With 92,000,000 people at home to feed and with our exports of breadstuffs alone running over \$100,000,000 annually, I am not afraid of the people of Canada, with 8,000,000 to feed at home and a large demand upon them from England, their parent country—I have no fear of our farmers being ruined and our Nation, from a commercial standpoint, crumbling into dust.

The continued trend of the people of the United States from the farms to the cities has resulted in an alarming condition as to the supply of food products. The volume of production is decreasing, while the number of mouths to be fed is constantly growing greater. If this continues, then the supplies from the Canadian farms will ultimately be our only salvation. The rush to the cities has already increased competition in labor, and to some extent cheapened labor in the cities. At the same time it has decreased the supply of labor on the farms, and not only increased the cost of producing the necessities of life, but added to the possibilities for extortion as a consequence of their scarcity.

Our farmers need not become panic-stricken. They are more alert and in a given hour of labor are more productive than their Canadian brothers. They are not to be thrown in competition with the poorly paid and more ill fed and scantily clothed labor of other nations of the world whose differing conditions make tariff walls essential, but they are to be lined up side by side in the market place with a high-minded, enterprising, and rapidly growing people with whom the American farmer can surely hold his own.

In the meantime the great body of food consumers in this country will be gratified by the disappearance of the tariff wall between the Canadian farm and the American home. And if by tearing it down I can add to the happiness and comfort of the American people I shall be proud of having done my duty. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared some remarks to make on this subject, which I had intended to read, but I will not do so, and will only refer to my manuscript occasionally.

I notice by the morning papers that our good President and the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], have been sleeping in the same bed. [Laughter.] I want to say, as a warning to our Republican President, that when he awakes from a dream he will find that he has been hobnobbing with a nightmare only. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have been a lifelong Republican. I expect to remain a lifelong Republican; and if I were wholly uninformed on this subject, if I had heard no discussion whatever about Canadian reciprocity and were to alight down in the city of Washington from the heavens in a flying machine, and should find that a Republican President and a Democratic leader were advocating the one and the same measure, I would, without asking a question, naturally oppose that proposition. [Laughter.] Especially so, Mr. Chairman, if it were, as this one is, a measure affecting the revenue of this Government.

This bill can not become a law with Republican votes. A vote taken in the House yesterday for the consideration of this bill revealed the fact that there were 69 Republicans and 126 Democrats in favor of it. [Applause.] I congratulate you, my Democratic friends, that this is the kind of measure that your party has always advocated. [Applause.] You are consistent and the 69 Republicans are inconsistent.

Mr. Chairman, a gentleman on the Democratic side of the House, an estimable gentleman, Mr. UNDERWOOD, from Alabama, a few minutes ago made the statement that this bill placing wheat on the free list would not lower the price of wheat in the American markets. If I correctly understood him, those were his exact words. Then I ask you gentlemen, why is he voting to take the revenue away from this Government, if, when he does that, he does not propose to lower the price of bread to the breadwinners of the United States? There is but one conclusion to draw from the gentleman's statement, and that is that he will disregard his constituency and all the people of the United States and cast his ballot for this measure solely in the interest of the Canadians.

I am going to make a bold statement here now, but without fear of successful contradiction from any man on either side

of the House. Point out to me in this proposed trade treaty one single item of reciprocity and I will show you a white black-bird. It is not in the law. It is proposed in this law to remove the existing duty of 25 cents per bushel on wheat coming from Canada into the United States. It is proposed further that flour shall remain on the protected list. We are an export Nation in wheat; we are producing more wheat and more flour than the people of the United States can consume. We exported last year upward of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat. Canada also exported last year more than 48,000,000 bushels of wheat. Are we hoping to get some Canadian markets for American-grown wheat? No; how can we export wheat from the United States into Canada so long as she has a surplus for export, I say, in the neighborhood of 50,000,000 bushels.

Again, gentleman, if you are enacting into law a measure for the benefit of consumers, the laboring man, the masses of the people in this country, then why do not you, my Democratic friends and my misguided Republican friends, put flour upon the free list?

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does not this proposed treaty cut down the tariff on flour 50 per cent?

Mr. FORDNEY. It cuts down the duty on flour, which is 25 per cent ad valorem. Based on the imports last year, it reduces the duty on flour coming from Canada into this country from one dollar and seventeen and a half cents to 50 cents per barrel.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is a little saving, is it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Why not take it all off? Are you interested in the great flouring mills of Minnesota in St. Paul and Minneapolis?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am willing to take it all off.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, I will take you at your word. If you will give me an opportunity to offer an amendment I will offer it, and I will bet you ten dollars to one that you will vote against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, the gentleman is not sincere about that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am as sincere as is the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. That may be. [Laughter.] The gentleman is on the Ways and Means Committee, is he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am.

Mr. KITCHIN. There has been a bill pending for 12 months in your committee to put flour and meat on the free list and you have never voted to bring it out. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me go a step further—

Mr. KITCHIN. Why do you not do it?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say, and I will be as frank as you are. I will offer this amendment and vote for it, and if carried will then vote against the bill, and the gentleman will vote for the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me ask the gentleman one question. The gentleman is going to offer an amendment to put flour on the free list for the express purpose of killing this bill, is he not? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no. I simply say, if you are going to punish the farmer by putting his finished products upon the free list, why protect the great flouring mills of this country?

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman not know that an amendment to put flour on the free list on this bill, coming from Canada, will defeat this bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. No.

Mr. KITCHIN. That it will defeat reciprocity?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; and neither does the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does not the gentleman believe it?

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman does not, and neither do I.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman not say that he is going to offer an amendment to put flour on the free list and then vote against it?

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a moment. Let me tell the gentleman from North Carolina that when the bill came before the Committee on Ways and Means I gave notice that I would offer an amendment to that bill, and was told by the friends of the measure that it could not be altered by the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

Mr. KITCHIN. The Republicans told the gentleman that?

Mr. FORDNEY. And the Democrats, too.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, they agreed on that proposition.

Mr. FORDNEY. But when it had been found by these people that the bill had been incorrectly drawn they came in and insisted that it must be amended.

Mr. KITCHIN. In accordance with the agreement between Canada and this country.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, wait a minute. I can not yield all of my time. The gentleman is a splendid fellow and I am very fond of him, but let me proceed a little.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He ought not to be unfair about this.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That amendment that was offered in the committee was offered solely for the purpose of making this bill conform to this agreement or treaty or whatever you may call it. Is not that true?

Mr. FORDNEY. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, what was it for?

Mr. FORDNEY. That may be the gentleman's conclusion, but it is not mine. I will come to that a little later on the wood-pulp matter, because I want to discuss that somewhat. The bill was incorrectly drawn, and it was not in conformity with the understanding between our representatives and the representatives of the Canadian Government in that agreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How did the gentleman find that out?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, my friend, I am 57 years old [laughter] and can read and think for myself.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield for a question before he leaves the subject of flour?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman from Michigan vote for a Democratic measure in the next Democratic Congress to put flour on the free list?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I never was known to vote for a Democratic tariff measure in my life and never expect to. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; just for a question.

Mr. HARDY. For what purpose will the gentleman offer an amendment to this bill, to which amendment he is opposed?

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, I will offer an amendment to put some little bit of flavor on it, and if you are going to compel us to swallow the pill, I want a grain of sugar to do it with. If you are going to put raw materials, the farmer's finished product, upon the free list, why in the name of common sense do you compel him to go into a protected market and purchase the things he must buy?

Mr. HARDY. Is the gentleman in favor of that amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and will vote for it and then vote against the bill if the amendment carries.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman is not in favor of free flour, is he?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am, in this measure.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman is not in favor of free flour?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am, so far as this bill is concerned. Mr. Chairman, it is proposed to give to Canada something and get something in return. It is proposed in this measure to put cattle, hogs, sheep, and all other animals on the free list. What is the finished product of the farmer in the way of cattle, hogs, and sheep? It is the live stock that the farmer has to sell. You place those items on the free list, and in the next breath, my friends, you put meats on the protected list. You can not justify that position with the good thinking people of this land.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield in just a minute. I submit that beefsteak is the raw material of the good housewife and laboring man, and if you put cattle, hogs, and sheep on the free list and compel the farmer to go into the free-trade markets to dispose of his finished products, how can you justify your position? You are protecting the great packing houses of this country, and there is no mistake about it. I will now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that our negotiators endeavored to have meats put upon the free list, but were unable to do so on account of the objection on the part of the Canadian negotiators?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; that may be true; but I know we have been bunkoed by the Canadian representatives into a free-trade measure, from which we will receive no benefits whatever. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the gentleman must realize that it was Canada who refused to reduce that duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. Why not? Of course they had the wisdom, and they exercised it and declined to accept anything that did not give them an advantage.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. In a moment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman then should not criticize this particular bill or the negotiators if they failed to do what he says he proposes to do by an amendment, or endeavor to do by an amendment.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me answer the gentleman from Ohio. I do criticize the bill. I do criticize our representatives for surrendering body, soul, and breeches to Canada. [Laughter.] Now I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman has said we were bunked in this bill. If so, who put the bunking on foot; who started it?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not; I can say that much. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. Who did?

Mr. FORDNEY. You know as much about it as I do. I know this much, my friends, that in the last year and a half Congress has appropriated \$400,000 of the people's money to aid the so-called tariff board in obtaining information to present to Congress that we might intelligently act upon such measures, and not one single word have we directly or indirectly had from that board. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The President makes no reference whatever in his message to the House to any report made by the tariff board.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. BURLESON. Will you vote for the continuation of the appropriation to support the present so-called tariff board to be carried in the next sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did vote for the creation of a permanent tariff board, with the hope that the board might report to Congress when Congress requires any information they may have as to the cost of production in this country on all articles mentioned in the tariff law and whatever reliable information they may have obtained as to the cost of the production of the same articles abroad. I did it reluctantly; I did it against my own good judgment, for I have not been in favor of a tariff commission, but I know that public sentiment in the country is in favor of a tariff board or tariff commission, because Congress has been criticized in the preparation of our last tariff bill; that it was too hastily prepared and without full knowledge on all subjects; and when it is possible for Congress to obtain any information that we have not heretofore had I want it.

Mr. BURLESON. To return to my question, if the permanent tariff commission bill is defeated, which is extremely probable, will the gentleman vote for the continuation of the appropriation, which will probably be \$400,000, to support the present so-called tariff board that will be provided for in the coming sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, that is a proper question, seriously asked, and I will answer it with all seriousness. As my mind is framed right now, I would hesitate to go another inch with that tariff board unless I am assured we can have some benefit from their knowledge after the expenditure of that large sum of money.

Mr. BURLESON. You will be given an opportunity to vote against it.

Mr. FORDNEY. But I give you an opportunity right now to vote for some little Republicanism, and you will not do it.

Mr. BURLESON. Not if I know it.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is one of those who have defended the last tariff bill on the theory that the men who framed it in the Ways and Means Committee were possessed of an abundance of accurate information.

Mr. FORDNEY. That was my candid opinion, sir.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. And in the process of its formation it became the duty of that committee to make a study of the economic conditions in Canada on articles they produce and the articles we produce, with reference to their consumption. Is that true?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. And is it not true that the gentleman and his associates on that committee are among the experts who have, if anything, a greater degree of knowledge relating to this very subject than any tariff board that was ever created in the history of this Government?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not quite understand that last statement.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the gentleman and his associates on that committee, many of them, be-

cause of their long experience in framing tariff measures, because of their detailed study of the economic conditions in this country and in Canada, are, if anything, more expert in this knowledge than the tariff board itself?

Mr. FORDNEY. Why, I think so. [Laughter.] I answer that sincerely. I think that the Committee on Ways and Means, with the information which they have obtained, is better informed than the President of the United States as between the two measures, this measure and the Payne tariff law—

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. If that is the case, then, and the gentleman—

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, wait a minute, my friend. I say this, and it is exceedingly valuable to the people of this country, that if we have not any information that we believe we have, I am ready and willing and anxious to get it, and if there is no other avenue through which it may come except through a tariff board, I am in favor of retaining the tariff board. I want information. I want to act intelligently on matters where I am called upon while in public life to cast my ballot affecting the interests of all the people of the whole country.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Just a short question.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Is not the argument of the gentleman and his associates who are opposed to this measure based upon the fact that there is knowledge regarding these matters which has been withheld from them?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know what information others have. I do not know what the tariff board knows. If I did, I would tell you all about it. But I am unable to get it. A resolution was introduced in our committee and passed unanimously and brought into this House, calling upon the tariff board for information on any article mentioned in this measure. I know not what became of the resolution, but I do know that no information came. And I say that some one is to blame and should be severely criticized for not laying before this committee available information upon any subject mentioned in the bill.

Now, let me go a little further. Farm machinery of every description is mentioned in this bill. This bill does not reduce the duty on farm machinery coming from Canada into the United States below the rate fixed in the Payne law, in a single item—not a fraction of a penny. It retains the present rate of duty on farm machinery of 15 per cent ad valorem.

But it does secure to the International Harvester Co. and other manufacturers of farm machinery of this country a lower rate of duty on farm machinery made in the United States and going into Canada. Tell me, in the name of common sense, in what way it was intended by that paragraph to benefit in the least the American farmer? If you are going to legislate for the masses of the people, remember that the farmers of this country are the bone and sinew of the Nation. You who live in the city must go to the farms for your bread and butter.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; in a minute. The farmer is the only man in the land that can put a stone wall around his property and live independent of the world. No lawyer, no merchant, no man in all the other varied walks of life in this land is so independent as the farmer in the production of the necessities of life.

Mr. JAMES. Did not the gentleman in the last session of Congress vote against a motion to recommit the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill—

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not remember, sir—

Mr. JAMES. And with direction to report back an amendment placing farming implements on the free list?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not remember such an amendment.

Mr. JAMES. Such an amendment was introduced, anyhow.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not doubt it.

Mr. JAMES. That was introduced for the benefit of the farmer.

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I beg to differ with the gentleman. The rates of duty mentioned in that bill do not belong to the same family that the rates do that are contained in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I worked many hours every day, and on Sundays, many times, with intelligent men preparing that tariff bill, and it is a compromise. It is not perfect. No tariff bill ever made was perfect, but it was the best we could obtain. Every amendment offered on the floor of the House when it came in here was to send it back and get more free trade into the bill than was in it, and I therefore voted against such amendments, and I am proud of that fact.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield for another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Just for a question.

Mr. JAMES. The point to which I was directing the attention of the gentleman was this: That at the last session of Congress the farmer was offered the opportunity of having free farming implements by an amendment that was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman voted against it, showing, according to the gentleman's contention, that his affection for the farmer was not as great then as it would appear to be now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Here is an opportunity afforded for the gentleman from Kentucky to vote now for the same effect that he claims he did then; but will he do it, or will he make the flimsy claim that by so doing it would defeat the bill?

Mr. JAMES. Is the gentleman asking me to accept his logic as to the purpose of amendments? The last time, he says, that we introduced an amendment it was for the purpose of defeating the bill. He is doing that very thing now.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think the gentleman would be a wiser man than he is now if he were to accept my logic. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. That may be so; but if so, the farmer would be worse off. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. I say that in all kindness.

Mr. JAMES. I assure the gentleman that what I said was in all kindness, especially to the farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. You would destroy him with your kindness. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me go to the subject of farm machinery, which it is proposed to keep on the protected list to protect the great institutions of this country, and not the consumers at all.

Mr. HILL. Before the gentleman goes to that, I hope he will state, in connection with the remark he has made, that farm machinery is now admitted into this country free from Canada, or can become so at any time, whenever Canada will admit it free from the United States.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; it comes in free from all the rest of the world except those Canadian people. Let me tell you, Mr. Danbury Hats— [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I am very glad, indeed, to listen to Mr. Canadian Logs. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. There is a provision in our tariff law that provides that there shall be no duty collected on any farm machinery coming from any country of the world into the United States unless such country imposes a duty upon our farm machinery going into that country. But go to the United States Treasury and look up statistics, and you will find but one country on God's green earth levying a duty upon our farm machinery, if they have farm machinery coming to our markets, except the lone country Canada. Farm machinery is free from all other countries of the world except Canada.

Now, as the gentleman has referred to "Mr. Canadian Logs," and I am somewhat of a logroller [laughter], let me say this, that this bill proposes to put rough lumber on the free list. Rough lumber coming from any country in the world into the United States to-day—pine lumber, not hard wood—pays a duty of \$1.25 per 1,000 feet, an ad valorem duty of about 7 per cent. This bill puts that class of lumber on the free list; but what does it do on dressed lumber, manufactured lumber, lumber with any work put upon it beyond rough lumber? It retains a duty of 5 per cent ad valorem and compels the American manufacturer when he ships his lumber to Canada to pay 25 per cent ad valorem. Oh, what a dandy deal! I am reminded of the time when I was a schoolboy trading jackknives unsight and unseen. The American boy in this deal gets a jackknife without handle, spring, or blade. [Laughter.] He is being flimflammed and will receive absolutely no benefits in return.

And, further, my friends, under the terms of this bill we are obliged to take Canada's lumber free of duty, knowing full well, as every man knows who is posted on the subject, that Canada has an embargo upon all her unmanufactured forest products, and not one dollar's worth of those products can come into our markets to-day except the small amount of pulp wood cut from so-called deeded lands.

But the question of lumber as compared with the importance of the agricultural and other interests is merely a minor matter. The time is drawing near at hand when all reasonable men must admit that the price of manufactured lumber and the price of timber in the forests in this country must advance. Our forests are fast becoming depleted. The demand for lumber is increasing annually because of increased consumption. The law of supply and demand will operate in a very short time to advance the price; and although the people of the country feel to-day that the price of lumber is high, the price will be much higher before the end of another decade unless we have panicky or unusual times.

Mr. AMES. Democratic times.

Mr. FORDNEY. Some gentleman says Democratic times. I hope not. I do not want to accuse my Democratic friends of being the cause of everything that goes wrong in this world.

Mr. BURLESON. We are going to have Democratic times; do not make any mistake about that. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. That threat and the fear of its possible fulfillment makes me sweat blood, because I know that if Democratic times do come, we, too, must help bear the burden and the loss, just as we had to during the last Democratic years, from 1893 to 1897.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WEISSE. In northern Wisconsin the hemlock forest owners are selling their logs at a price that nets them no money for standing timber. All that the mills are paying for the logs is enough to cover the labor and the cost of getting the logs out. The landowners are getting nothing for their stumpage at the present time. Now, there is no doubt that lumber will not be any cheaper when they are cutting the trees and getting nothing for them, unless some one will cut them at a loss.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, my friends, if you will go into the lumber business you will find that if you have a lumber operation and a mill on your hands and bills payable coming due, at times you will sell at a sacrifice to save what little of your property you can and avoid going into complete bankruptcy, and that is just what many lumbermen are doing to-day. But let me tell you what you are doing when you vote for a measure like this. I have the figures here to bear out my statement. There are to-day 48,322 sawmills in the United States, employing in round numbers 1,250,000 men, who support a population of 5,000,000 of people. Some gentleman speaks about lowering the price of foodstuffs and articles of use in the cost of living and still maintaining high prices for labor. The man who makes that statement either is not well informed or is not sincere. It is a physical impossibility. How are you going to maintain wages and lower the cost of the products of that labor? Such views are inconsistent. It is used for political buncombe only and is not sincere. Are you going to discriminate against the 5,000,000 people who depend on the wages of the men engaged in the lumber industry, to say nothing about the capital invested? If so, well and good. I can live on woodchuck if you can, but I do not like to do it. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, it has been said here that there are in Canada many of the so-called deeded lands that are not affected by this bill. There are but a few thousand acres of so-called deeded lands in Canada. Read the last section on the last page of the bill. It refers to print paper and pulp. There you will find some sop for the great metropolitan newspapers and magazines of this country—absolutely in their interest and no other interest in the world. This bill will permit, if enacted into law, free print paper from Canada to come into our markets without any qualification whatever as to her restriction on wood or her forest product. There are \$300,000,000 invested in the pulp and paper mills of the United States, and from statistics which I received from the Bureau of the Census yesterday there are 112,000 men employed in those mills. A very learned gentleman, a Member of this House, well informed on the subject, who came before our committee, stated that it was only a question of a very short time until many of our pulp and paper mills must go out of commission unless they can obtain a portion of their wood supplies from Canada. And yet, my friends, you are perfectly willing to transfer that industry to Canada, exclude our paper and pulp mills from the Canadian market for raw material, and open up the American market to Canadian-made paper without asking anything whatever in return.

I hope to have an opportunity, as I had in the committee, to offer an amendment which will provide, if adopted, that no print paper or wood pulp shall come into our market from Canada free of duty until each and every one of the Provinces of Canada have removed their restriction on their forest product and permit our pulp and paper mills to go there for raw material, which is as follows:

That the articles mentioned in the following paragraph, the product or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be exempt from duty, namely:

Pulp wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news print paper and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper: *Provided*, That no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), is imposed by or in Canada or any Province or subdivision thereof upon any such pulp, paper or board, or any pulp wood.

Provided also, That the President of the United States shall first have satisfactory evidence and make proclamation that all such pulp, paper, and board, the product or manufacture of the United States, are admitted from the United States free of duty into all parts of Canada.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Not at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Was that amendment offered in the committee?

Mr. FORDNEY. That amendment was offered in the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Was it rejected?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; as all other amendments offered by me were rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What was the reason assigned for rejecting the amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. There was no reason whatever except that any amendment would defeat the measure. Every man who gives 15 minutes' study to the merits of the proposed Canadian agreement ought to be ready and willing to defeat it, no matter through what channel he might do it. It is absolutely against the interests of the American people and wholly in the interest of Canada.

My friends, last year we sold abroad a little over \$1,800,000,000 worth of American manufactures and agricultural products. We purchased from the whole world a little over \$1,500,000,000 worth, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of \$301,000,000. Now listen, and put this down in your memorandum book, and never forget it.

One hundred and twenty million eight hundred and sixteen thousand dollars of that \$301,000,000 balance of trade in our favor was with Canada. We sold Canada last year, the calendar year of 1910, \$215,000,000 worth of our goods and purchased from Canada but \$95,000,000 worth.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that the Payne bill would have been defeated in the House if the provisions of this treaty had been embodied in that bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe it should have been defeated by a unanimous vote on the Republican side, and I know it never would have received my vote.

Mr. LANGLEY. It never would have received mine either, because I believe there are some provisions in the proposed treaty that violate the principle of protection as I have always understood them.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman. Now let me go a little further. We are going to give up to Canada that great and magnificent balance of trade so much needed in this country in order, in a measure, to maintain our gold supply of money.

The House of Representatives, since I have had the honor to be a Member of it, passed a so-called Cuban reciprocity measure, the only reciprocity treaty on our statute books to-day, and while I feel like criticizing some of my Republican friends on this side of the House for voting for it, it received almost the unanimous vote of the Democratic side of the House. But what did it do? It did not put any of the competitive articles on the free list, but it reduced our rates of duty on Cuban goods coming to this country 20 per cent below that collected on the same class of goods coming from other countries. In return Cuba gave us a 20 per cent better rate on our goods going into Cuba than she gives any other country in the world. But what happened? Within 14 days from the time that reciprocity measure became a law the Cuban Congress raised their duties on all her imports 20 per cent.

So that since the enactment of that law American goods have paid the same rate of duty going into Cuba that they paid before the treaty became a law, and we have given Cuba a 20 per cent advantage in our markets. Now, let me call your attention to the results. The best proof of the pudding in the world, my friends, is in eating it, and let me say that while it takes some men a long, long time to learn through their noddle some things, they learn mighty quickly through their stomachs. The year before the adoption of the Cuban reciprocity treaty the balance of trade against us was \$8,071,084. That balance against us has grown until for the calendar year of 1910 the balance against the United States with Cuba was \$70,043,000.

Mr. COX of Indiana. With Cuba?

Mr. FORDNEY. With Cuba. That is our balance of trade against us for the year 1910, and what did we do in that treaty? We reduced the duty on imported raw sugar from Cuba 20 per cent below the former rates as provided for in the Dingley law. Did that law change the price of sugar to the consumer, I ask you? I have followed the question closely from that time down to the present, and taken statistics fur-

nished by Willets and Gray, the greatest sugar statisticians in the country, with an establishment in New York, and I find that those statistics have invariably shown that the price of raw sugar in New York has always been lower than in London, and the price of granulated sugar in New York has always been higher than the price of granulated sugar in London.

In addition to that, let me say the price of granulated sugar to the consumers of the United States from the adoption of that law down to the present time has been higher than for the decade prior to the adoption of that law. Who has received the benefit of Cuban reciprocity? Since the adoption of that law we have imported 11,500,000 tons of sugar from Cuba, and the 20 per cent reduction that we gave to them has deprived the United States Treasury of over \$77,000,000 of much-needed revenue. Yet in the face of this fact you would vote for this bill. I did not vote for that Cuban treaty, I am happy to say. That law was forced upon Congress by our President, then calling Congress into extra session, in order to compel the Republican House of Representatives and the Republican Senate to either turn down the President or adopt the law. Rather than rebuke the Republican President, many men on this side of the House voted against their honest convictions and voted for the law, and made a most serious mistake. Who, I ask again, has been benefited by this Cuban reciprocity? Only one interest in the whole land. Not the Cubans, for they have received little or nothing in advance for their raw sugar as compared with the prices received before the adoption of the law; but the great American sugar refining companies and the Arbuckle Sugar Refining Co. and the Federal sugar refining companies of this country received nearly all of those benefits. These refining companies are the only purchasers for Cuban raw sugars, and yet you propose to repeat the dose and give to Canada just what you gave to the great American sugar trusts in this country.

When we adopted Cuban reciprocity there was some excuse for the gentlemen on this side voting for it. There was no free trade in the reciprocity treaty with Cuba. It was a reduction of duties and not free trade.

Mr. Chairman, I would strike out all of lines 10, 11, and 12, page 1, of this bill and transfer the same to line 3, page 16, which page contains the free list. This would transfer fresh meats—beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and all such meats—to the free list.

I would do this because of the fact that cattle, hogs, sheep, and all other animals are placed on the free list in the bill.

I would also strike out all of lines 4 and 5, page 3, of this bill and transfer the same to page 20, at the end of line 23. By such transfer we would place wheat flour, semolina, and rye flour on the free list. I would do this because of the fact that wheat is on the free list in this bill.

I would strike out all of lines 18 to 25, inclusive, on page 4, of this bill and transfer to the free list, on page 19, at the end of line 9. Such an amendment would place farm wagons and finished parts thereof, plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers or horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, including wind stackers, baggers, weighers, and such like, on the free list. I would place farm machinery on the free list in this bill, for if it is fair to place everything on the free list that is produced by the farmer it is only fair that he should be able to go into our markets and make purchases of things above mentioned without the payment of duties. I would compel Canada to remove all her restrictions on her raw forest products, such as logs and pulp wood, before I would permit her finished products to come into our markets free of duty.

I submit, sir, that it is only fair that we have unrestricted access to Canada's forests, if we must take her finished products free of duty.

Our good President has said:

The present business system of the country rests on the protective tariff, and any attempt to change it to a free-trade basis will certainly lead to disaster.

Those words were uttered by William H. Taft. I ask, What has brought about this change of heart? I ask it with all sincerity.

He is quoted as having also said:

I did not agree, nor did the Republican Party agree, that we would reduce rates to such a point as to reduce prices by the introduction of foreign competition. That is what the free traders desire; that is what the revenue tariff reformers desire; but that is not what the Republican platform promised, and it is not what the Republican Party wished to bring about.

Something has evidently occurred since the public utterance above quoted was made and before the time he approved of this so-called Canadian trade treaty.

Peter Cooper once said:

No goods purchased abroad are cheap that take the place of our own labor and our own raw material.

Will not the agricultural products mentioned in this bill, if admitted into our markets, take the place of goods produced in this country?

Abraham Lincoln once said:

I do not know much about the tariff, but I do know this much: When we buy goods abroad, we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money; when we buy goods made at home, we get both the goods and the money.

No more correct definition of our policy of protection was ever given than those few words uttered by Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Chairman, put into law this proposed trade treaty with Canada, bring the farmers of the United States directly in competition with Canadian farmers, and the result unquestionably will be lower prices if we must meet this competition.

Mr. Chairman, the agitation of the question alone since the day our good President sent this bill to Congress has caused the price of wheat in Minneapolis to drop from \$1.06½ per bushel to from 96 cents to 98 cents—a loss to the American wheat grower in his own market of from 8 to 10 cents per bushel. If agitation alone will bring such a serious loss to our farmers, what will the bill if enacted into law do?

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, for the last two or three years I have been so busy wrestling with Republicans that I have not had time to read the Bible very much, but when I look over on that side and see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] locking horns with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], and other valiant Republicans lined up on the two sides I can not help recalling the beautiful One hundred and thirty-third Psalm:

Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!

It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard: that went down to the skirts of his garments.

I have been very optimistic, first and last, in my views of the political situation—so much so that the newspapers throughout the country have chaffed me about chasing rainbows until midnight or thereabouts on the 8th day of November, when they suddenly ceased from that form of recreation. During the last 16 years, no difference what happened or how thoroughly we were walloped at any election, I immediately predicted that two years afterwards we would win. [Laughter and applause.] I was as a voice crying in the wilderness, but I knew that if I kept on prophesying long enough I would hit it at last [laughter], and I did. But I never was optimistic enough in all my imaginings to suppose I would ever live to see a day when my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] would stand up on this floor engaged in fighting the administration, making an appeal to the American farmer against a measure supported by a Republican President, and warning the House not to act with undue haste.

I regard him as the Marshal Ney of the army of protection, and I believe that this day he led the Old Guard to its Waterloo. [Applause.] Time and time again I have pleaded for longer discussions of bills in this House against his demand for an immediate vote. He uttered one great truth which I desire to commend to the Democrats in this House, and that is that this bill is "an un-Republican measure." [Applause.] I thank the gentleman for that word. It is the truth. He says we recognize our own; and we did, thank God. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is very much cast down because he finds President Taft and myself in the same bed. It is an old saying that politics makes strange bedfellows. I will tell you why we are in the same bed—because President Taft has come part of the way into the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I stand here to-day and welcome the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], and the rest of you who are voting with us and fighting with us, I welcome you into the ranks of the Democracy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While I welcome them, I invite my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], Brother FORDNEY, and those still in the gall of bitterness, to come into the Democratic church and make the good confession. There is room for all.

Whenever any Republican comes and offers to vote for a Democratic measure I am willing to take him by the hand and to take him in [laughter] and fight our battles with him. I want to put this situation as it is, and I can prove it by every man here, too. For the last six or eight years there has been no reformatory measure—not one—put through Congress except by the aid of Democratic votes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You could not have passed one of them, and you know it. You could not have passed the Cuban reciprocity

bill to have saved your souls without us; you could not have passed the Porto Rican bill without us; you could not have passed the Philippine tariff bill without us.

You could not have passed a single bill for the regulation of railroads to save your necks if we had not have stood here like a stone wall. The press of the country, however, gave the Republicans all the credit, and the Republicans very complacently accepted the credit, and I am sick and tired of it. I want it understood hereafter that when we pass bills that we, the Democrats, pass them; that we are doing the leading, and the Republican fragment that votes with us is doing the trailing or following, and we are not doing it. [Applause on the Republican side.] The President comes to us. We do not go to him. He seems to have heard from the last election, which went Democratic on the tariff question by a sweeping majority.

Mr. SWASEY. The gentleman wants the credit, does not he?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; we will get the credit, and do not you forget it. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; if it is a pertinent question.

Mr. GAINES. I think it is. Does the gentleman think that sort of an assertion will tend to promote the entente cordiale that seems to have grown up between himself and certain distinguished Republicans on this floor and elsewhere in this country, or is he endeavoring to have fun at their expense?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not endeavoring to have fun at their expense. I want to place this situation before the American people as it is precisely [applause], and while I am at it I might as well attend to the gentleman from West Virginia now as later on. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Personally, I have great esteem for him; but he stood up here yesterday and declared that he was going to offer certain free-trade amendments to this bill. Nothing quite so sudden has happened in this world since Saul of Tarsus journeyed from Jerusalem down to Damascus as the conversion of my brother from West Virginia to the doctrine of free trade.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me in that connection—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, sir.

Mr. GAINES (continuing). To say that I have not been converted?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know that.

Mr. GAINES. I think I never can be converted to the doctrine of free trade. I simply have always been in favor of a consistent protection that would give the farmer of this country equal chance under the protection laws of the country with the manufacturer, and I regret to see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] favoring the manufacturers at the expense of the farmers of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is an old saying, "Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts." That is sufficient answer to the gentleman from West Virginia. Now, he wants to make it appear that he is a better tariff reformer than I am. The amendments which he proposes to offer and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] proposes to offer are not intended to help the bill or help pass the bill. They are intended to prevent the passage of it. And a man that is a big enough fool to be roped in by any such performance as that ought to be taken out into some cool and sequestered spot and tapped for the simples. [Laughter.] Nothing else will cure him but that.

Mr. GAINES. Is that the way you propose to treat Democratic insurgents hereafter?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No. They are coming home. You need not be uneasy about that.

I am in favor of this Canadian reciprocity scheme—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of amendments, I would like to ask him why he says the amendments are for the purpose of defeating this bill—defeating the reciprocal relations with Canada?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you precisely. In order to get this measure, or treaty, or whatever you may be pleased to call it, adopted, the Canadian Government and our Government must come to an agreement on precisely the same thing. They are considering this same bill which we are considering. If we change it, it goes back to the commissioners. If they change it, it goes back to the commissioners. The commissioners might report it out favorably immediately, and then they would have to go through the performance of adopting it if we

changed it, and we would have to go through the performance of adopting it if they changed it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. One other question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman aware that when the reciprocity treaty was arranged between France and Canada in 1907 to 1909 that, as a matter of fact, the French Senate did amend the treaty in a very important respect, and that Canada promptly came to terms?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That might be. I do not say that Canada would not come to terms.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Then it will not destroy the agreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not say that Canada would not come to terms if we changed it, and I do not say we would not come to terms if Canada changed it, but what I do say is, that if either one of us changes it, it must go back to the commissioners again, and that is an endless chain performance that I have no use for.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. Is the gentleman exactly correct—I know he intends always to be—in his statement that Canada is considering precisely this same bill? Canada is not considering precisely the same proposition, although Canada is, of course, considering a bill which was provoked by this convention or agreement between the two countries. Is the gentleman authorized to say that any one of the American commissioners has agreed to the proposition contained in the Canadian bill, when they provide that any advantages given us by their bill shall be shared by all countries that have the favored-nation treaty with Great Britain?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I do not care to go into that, as it would take too much of my time. I have stated substantially what the situation is. I have always been this sort of a philosopher, or statesman, or whatever you please to call it, that if I can not get a whole loaf I will take a half loaf rather than to have no bread at all. And I think that is practical and wise. This bill is merely a step in the right direction.

I am not in favor of every item in this bill. If I had been drawing a reciprocity treaty I would have drawn it differently from this in a great many respects. But I was not drawing the treaty. I have got to do one of two things with respect to this bill, and that is either to vote for it intact or to vote to amend it and practically kill it, because that is what the amendment of it would amount to.

There have been three or four good Democratic speeches made on this bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS], and three of those men are to be members of the next Democratic Ways and Means Committee, which has been already selected so far as the Democratic members are concerned. Mr. PALMER states his case in a nutshell in these words:

In the consideration of a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and any foreign country the discussion is very apt to lose sight of two important factors. First, that it takes two to make a bargain, and the agreement must, from the necessities of the case, contain concessions on the part of each of the contracting parties; and, second, that the bargain when made applies with equal force and effect and extends to every part of the countries affected.

I wish to suggest to my party fellows that if this bill is passed it is not the end of the chapter or the end of the world. At high noon on the 4th day of March we shall come into the possession of this House, and if this treaty does not go as far as we want it to go, we can then make it go still further. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman says his party will come into power after the 4th of March?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the House.

Mr. DALZELL. Suppose this treaty does not pass at this session of Congress. What will his party do with it if it is put up to them at the next session of Congress?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Would you pass this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think we might amend it and pass it. The chances are that we would pass a tariff bill that would very largely take the place of this bill; a bill that, to say nothing of this bill at all, will go into every branch of the subject; a bill or bills. And I want to say that while I am in favor of taking a separate bill for a separate schedule in order to expedite revision downward, in the end 14 separate bills for

14 separate schedules would amount to an entire tariff bill. The Democrats are committed to a revision of the tariff, and, so far as this House is concerned, we are going to revise it, wisely and thoroughly, according to promise.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. I want to inquire if the gentleman is accepting this bill as a substitute for a general tariff revision?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Good heavens, no! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I am accepting this for what it is worth, and no more, as a step in the right direction.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us what it is worth?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The chief thing that this country needs in its business is a wider market, and I am in favor of this reciprocity bill because it gives wider markets to American products. That will be one great point gained. Considered as a whole our exports are large, but our per capita exports are smaller than those of any other great commercial nation on earth, which is not a healthy condition. As much as any other living man I desire to see them increased. Therefore I am for this bill, because it will increase our exports. I am in favor of this bill because it establishes closer trade relations with one of our nearest neighbors, and the closer trade relations you have with your neighbors the better off you are. When Thomas Jefferson delivered his first inaugural on the 4th day of March, 1801, he enunciated the principles upon which this Government should be conducted, and one of the principles was: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none." That has been the mainspring of our policy ever since, or should have been. We have spent or will spend somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500,000,000 to build the Panama Canal. Therefore I am in favor of the reciprocity treaty to promote our trade relations. That is what we spent that money for. We are not spending that vast sum because we are altruists, but as a business matter. I am for it, because I hope to see the day when the American flag will float over every square foot of the British-North American possessions clear to the North Pole. They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the difficult art of self-government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman favor the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and making free trade with Canada on all products?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. By taking Canada in to become a part of the United States; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. No; I mean commercially. Would the gentleman support a policy of complete free trade with Canada on all products?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would support a Democratic tariff bill, prepared by the Ways and Means Committee, brought into a Democratic House, and passed by that Democratic House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. A bill putting all Canadian importations on the free list?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never said any such a thing.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I am asking you that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not make any difference what you are asking.

I believe in universal peace. I am in favor of that. I have never joined the universal peace society. My kindred have fought in every war that this country ever waged. Nine of my kinsmen on my father's side were in the Revolutionary Army, and several on my mother's side; but I am in favor of universal peace, and I am in favor of this reciprocity treaty because it helps along the cause of universal peace. [Applause.] I believe that commercial relations properly established with the nations of the earth and The Hague Peace Tribunal will bring universal peace. I extract infinite pleasure out of the prospect of a flying machine. It will do two things which I want to see done. It will put an end to war, because you can not have a war if somebody can get above an army with a bucket of dynamite and kill 10,000 men in 10 seconds. Flying machines will also put an end to this high protective tariff system, because you can not collect the tariff from a man unless you catch him with the goods on him. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to ask the gentleman something along the line of universal peace. As I understand it, the gentleman favors this bill for at least one reason—that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I have no doubt about that.

Mr. NORRIS. Will that have a tendency to preserve peace with Great Britain?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, certainly it will. I do not have any doubt whatever that the day is not far distant when Great Britain will joyfully see all of her North American possessions become a part of this Republic. That is the way things are tending now.

Having said that much, I want to say another thing. I do not confine my support of reciprocity bills to this one. I am in favor of reciprocity treaties with the Central and South American Republics, including Mexico. [Applause.] The quicker we get them the better off we will be. Of course, as between the two, if we had to have reciprocity with Canada and not with those countries to the south, or with the countries to the south and not with Canada, I would take reciprocity with Canada.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Was the gentleman correctly quoted in the newspapers this morning, where it was stated that in his speech last night he said he was in favor of this kind of reciprocity with the entire world?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not say "this kind."

Mr. NORRIS. Well, reciprocity.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman was speaking of this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes. I was going to state that as soon as I got through with this.

Mr. NORRIS. Were the newspapers correct when they stated that the President, who followed you, said he was likewise of the same opinion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My recollection is that the newspapers quoted us about right. [Applause.] Of course, I am not undertaking to report the President's speech. I made the first speech, and I declared in favor of three things in that speech on reciprocity: First, in favor of this Canadian reciprocity; in the second place, in favor of reciprocity with Mexico and Central and South America; and in the third place, reciprocity with all the nations of the civilized world. That is what I declared in favor of. I can report my own speech. My recollection is that the newspapers stated it correctly when they said that the President indorsed the three propositions which I laid down. [Applause and laughter.] If he had spoken first and laid them down I would have indorsed them just as readily as he seemed to indorse them when I laid them down. [Applause.]

Two souls with but a single thought,
Two hearts that beat as one.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks there is any danger of any contention in the Democratic Party for the next presidential nomination between himself and the President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, not a bit. My guess is that I will get it, hands down. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. I hope so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since that subject is raised, I would like to say in a public way what I have frequently said in private to inquiring and enthusiastic friends. I am not running for President. I do not lie awake nights inducing insomnia by pestering my head to count Clark delegates for the national convention, or Clark votes in the electoral college, but I am not fool enough to decline a nomination that has not been offered to me. [Laughter and applause.]

And another thing, while I am not a candidate, it is decidedly pleasant to have newspapers refer to you in that high connection. Now, while the committee business has been somewhat changed by Democratic action, one of the finest mots I ever heard in Washington I heard Speaker CANNON utter along in December in 1907. He was then busy in making up his committees. The secretary of the House of Commons, Sir Courtney Gilbert, was over here, and Hon. Asher C. Hinds gave a luncheon in the basement to Sir Courtney. The Speaker, Mr. Williams, myself, and several others were present; the Speaker was in a hurry. He did not stay until the luncheon was finished, but when he got up to go, after he had lighted his cigar, he said:

Sir Courtney, before I go I want to leave this reflection with you, that the man that is Speaker of the House immediately preceding a presidential election is frequently favorably referred to as a presidential candidate until after he appoints his committees.

[Laughter and applause.]

I feel about it as did that masterful great man, Thomas Brackett Reed. In the spring of 1896 somebody asked him if he thought he would be nominated for President at St. Louis. He replied, "They may go further and fare worse, and I suppose they will."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri two questions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Go ahead.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman accept the Presidency of the new country to be established under the universal peace system to which he has just referred?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With a great deal of pleasure; yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That question being disposed of, I ask the gentleman if, as a matter of policy, in the event of the passage of this Canadian reciprocity treaty, the gentleman would favor legislation by treaty with European countries? He has referred to those in South America—would he favor reciprocal treaties with countries of the Old World; for instance, Germany, France, Italy, and so forth?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, of course, whenever we could get the better of the bargain. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would these reciprocal treaties with European countries contemplate the raising of revenue sufficient to run this Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, if we did not get enough money in that way, we would collect it by a graduated income tax, and that would bring in enough. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One more question and I am done. Then, the gentleman, if he could not raise sufficient revenue by the new system of tariff for revenue, would raise it by direct tax upon the people of the United States?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would raise it by a graduated income tax, with about \$6,000 or \$7,000 exemption, and I think it would be the justest tax that was ever levied. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Speaking of the Presidency, I want to say that if we can not have a Republican President next time I would be delighted to have a brother Campbellite like the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am obliged to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has stated that he favored reciprocity with European countries if he could get the better end of the bargain. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that we have the better end of the bargain in this reciprocity treaty, and will he kindly demonstrate the ground on which he bases that opinion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is my judgment that we get the better of the proceeding in this treaty. The only objection that such illustrious agriculturists as my friend from Pittsburg makes is that the poor farmers will suffer. [Laughter.] I live in a country where they farm sure enough.

I live in the great Mesopotamian district of the western world, right down between the Mississippi and the Missouri, one of the richest districts in America. I have stated on the stump in that district a thousand times, and I repeat it here now, that the agricultural schedule is largely a humbug, a delusion, and a snare—that it is put in there to catch gudgeons. [Laughter and applause.] The intelligent farmers of America know that the agricultural products of Canada are inconsiderable when compared with the agricultural products of the United States. To use a common phrase, they do not constitute a drop in the bucket. They also know that wages are as high in Canada in many lines as in America, and higher in labor pertaining to the production of lumber, so they know too much to be scared by the overworked cry of "pauper labor."

There is a tariff of 25 cents a bushel on wheat, and one good, healthy man with a good appetite can come very near eating all the wheat imported into the United States in 12 months. There is a tariff of 15 cents a bushel on corn, and yet you can raise more corn on a farm of 300 acres in Missouri than is imported into the United States in a year. Under the Dingley bill it was 25 cents per bushel. The Payne bill cut it to 15. There was no fall in the price of corn, which sustains my contention that the agricultural schedule is largely a humbug. There is no place to import corn from. I wondered for years and years how it happened that they did not raise as much corn and as good corn in the same latitude of South America as we live in north of the Equator. It looks as if they ought to raise more, because it is farther from ocean to ocean. I could not find out, and so I wrote to Secretary Wilson. I told him that he knew everything about corn, and I would like to know why that was. He wrote back to me that he did not know much more about it than I did, but that they did raise a good deal of corn, but it was a very inferior quality; that it would not compete with ours.

Two or three years after I gave up the search, one day I was traveling on a train with a drummer, and we fell into conversation. Men of his class know a great deal; they are a very enlightened people, the torchbearers of information. I got to talking with him about it. He had been down there and he said he would tell me. He said they sowed their corn broadcast down there, like we used to sow wheat up here before we invented the drill, and the consequence was that they raised a fine crop of nubbins and very little corn. At last, however, the Argentine Republic has learned how to plant corn and to raise it. I can tell you another thing about the Argentine Republic. Last year for the first time the Argentine Republic exported more corn to Europe than we did. And here they are fooling the farmers, or trying to, with a tariff of 15 cents a bushel on corn!

What are we doing with corn? We have agents in Europe going around over the country cooking corn bread on street corners in the big cities and dispensing it free to teach foreign peoples to eat corn bread, in order to make a market for our corn.

There is a tariff of 5 cents a dozen on foreign-laid eggs, and I will guarantee that unless the eggs are imported for the purpose of starting a new breed of chickens no man or woman ever saw a foreign-laid egg south of the north edge of Minnesota in the United States. There is a duty of 3 cents a head on foreign-raised cabbages, to gull the farmers, and so on to the end of the chapter. Thirty dollars a head on foreign mules!

I will tell you what happened over here at these tariff hearings. Capt. White, of Kansas City, a big lumber merchant and manufacturer of lumber, was arguing that they ought to have a tariff on lumber, because they had to pay a tariff on mules and wagons and saws and engines, and all the rest of it. I said, "Captain, these eastern men on this committee do not know anything about mules at all. Now, you tell these eastern brethren whether or not you would have four, six, or eight Mexican mules if they would give them to you as a gracious gift and compel you to drive them to one of your wagons." He said no, he would not; and yet they come in here with this kind of stuff and undertake to deceive the farmer.

One of the questions asked by the gentleman from Nebraska reminds me of this: My friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] the other day said there never had been a day when the Republicans were in possession of this Government that you could not have a reciprocity treaty. That may be so, but it is a very strange thing, if that is true, that we have never had any. I wonder if he has forgotten what McKinley did? McKinley appointed John A. Kasson to negotiate reciprocity treaties with the great commercial nations of the world, and he negotiated 24 of them. He is a Republican of high degree. Men stand up here and talk about President Taft being a Democrat. There is not one of you who will dare stand up here and say that McKinley was a Democrat.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman not know that the Congress of the United States refused in every instance to adopt the Kasson treaties?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to tell you in a minute if you will just let me finish my own story in my own way. William McKinley, a Republican President of high renown, appointed John A. Kasson, of Iowa, a Republican of great ability and high renown, whose Republicanism was never impeached, to negotiate reciprocity treaties. He negotiated 24 with the great nations of the earth, and this talk of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] about McKinley meaning reciprocity in noncompeting articles only is absolutely preposterous, in the light of those treaties.

I set one of them out in a speech here once in full, I think it was one with France, and hundreds of competing items were in that reciprocity treaty. Now, what happened? McKinley sent all 24 of those treaties to the Senate with the recommendation that they adopt them, and that Republican Senate never adopted a single one of them.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman will permit, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken. I do not think he can lay his fingers on a single solitary sentence of Mr. McKinley approving of or recommending the adoption of a single treaty—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman, Did not Mr. McKinley transmit those treaties to the Senate?

Mr. DALZELL. Undoubtedly he did; and the Senate—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute; I am going to ask the gentleman another question. Was he under any compulsion to transmit those treaties to the Senate?

Mr. DALZELL. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why?

Mr. DALZELL. It was his duty as President to transmit them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did not Washington pocket treaties which were made and never sent to the Senate?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I do not know—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I know if the gentleman does not. Did not Thomas Jefferson alienate temporarily the affections of one of his very best friends, James Monroe, by pocketing one of his treaties and never sending it to the Senate at all? How many treaties did Andrew Jackson put in his pocket and walk off with?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I think what I said was there was never an hour since the organization of the Republican Party but what reciprocity treaties had been in operation, and the very time to which the gentleman refers, the treaties proposed by Mr. Kasson under section 4 of the McKinley bill, there were treaties with almost every country in Europe under section 3—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that.

Mr. HILL. And the Hawaiian reciprocity treaty was in operation at that time, and there has never been an hour—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And we had that reciprocity treaty with the Sandwich Islands because from the very beginning we proposed to swallow them whole. That is the secret of that thing. If the Republicans are so vehemently in favor of reciprocity, why did not a Republican Senate ratify those 24 reciprocity treaties?

Mr. HILL. They were reported favorably by a Republican committee, and if the gentleman asks me to state why, I will tell him—they were hypnotized by a lot of cheap jewelry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Who hypnotized them?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman knows as well as I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean to say the Republican contingent in the United States Senate was so ignorant and so superstitious that it could be hypnotized by a lot of cheap jewelry?

Mr. HILL. It was not entirely Republican, either.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I paid the gentleman from Connecticut a high compliment at the beginning of this speech by saying he had made a good speech. I would not like to indorse it all. I would prefer to go through his speeches and read them before I indorse them, but it was a good Democratic speech in spots. [Applause.] That is what it was, and reciprocity is a good Democratic doctrine in spots, and until we can get a general Democratic tariff bill perfected and put upon the statute books I am going to stand by this treaty. Now, another thing—

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, might I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. In order that I may know just what reciprocal spots do seem attractive to the gentleman from Missouri, I would ask him whether he would favor a reciprocal arrangement with Mexico for the free admission of Mexican lead and zinc ore.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am in favor of the very same thing with Mexico about lead and zinc ore that I am with every other country under the sun about every other article under the sun. I am in favor of a revenue tariff on every article except the necessities of life. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] The proper function of levying a tariff is to raise revenue enough to support the Government economically and effectively administered.

In levying that revenue the higher rates ought to be on the luxuries of life and the lowest rates, or none at all, on the necessities of life. There are some exceptions about the luxuries, and one of them is that there are certain things which you can get in so easily that it would invite smuggling if you make the rates high. As to luxuries that were finished luxuries products, I would put the higher tariff on the finished product, because it would give our men employment here.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me? It is, of course, my fault that I can not interpret his answer, but since I can not will he kindly inform me whether he would favor a reciprocal agreement admitting free lead and zinc ore from Mexico?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would levy a revenue tax on lead and zinc, iron and coal, and cobalt, and everything that comes into the United States, except on the necessities of life. Nothing on earth would induce me to help report a tariff bill which puts a tariff on salt. I would not do it, because free salt is a hereditary Missouri doctrine. Thomas Hart Benton worked for 28 years to get salt on the free list. And Theodore Roose-

vett, who is somewhat of a Republican at least [laughter]—and it is hard to tell who is a Republican just now [laughter]—

Mr. PRINCE. The Speaker is a Republican.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I rather think the Speaker is. [Applause.] I do not believe I ever have had any trouble in locating the Speaker, or that he has had any trouble in locating me. That is my honest opinion.

But I am not going to make a speech about him to-day. I am going to talk about Col. Roosevelt for a minute. Col. Roosevelt wrote a "Life of Thomas H. Benton," and I will say that it is the best volume in the American Statesmen Series. He says in that book that Col. Benton deserved the greatest credit—not ordinary credit, but "the greatest credit"—for his long and successful fight to put salt on the free list. And when Col. Benton got salt placed on the free list, he said, in his pompous way, that he imagined he could hear the flocks and herds on a thousand hills bellowing out their love and gratitude to him, and if they had known what he was doing that is what they would have done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to repeat what I am in favor of on the tariff and, as I understand it, what the Democrats are in favor of. I do not suppose we can get to it in a week, or a month, or a year, or maybe 10 years, all around, exactly. It is hard to approximate it. In levying a tariff I am in favor of putting the highest tariff on the luxuries of life, except in those cases where the luxury is of such a character that it would invite smuggling. I am in favor of putting the lowest tariff, or none at all, on the necessities of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And just exactly in proportion as things become necessary, I would take the tariff off of them and put them on the free list, or lower the tariff on them to the vanishing point. I do not think anybody can misunderstand that or misconstrue it.

Now, while I am at it, I want to say this, that neither myself nor any of my party associates has the slightest desire whatever to injure any legitimate business in America—none whatever. [Applause.] It is a thing incredible that any sane man would want to do that. We have as much at stake in the Republic as you have. We did as much to make it what it is as you did. Our ancestors have been here as long as yours have. They fought as valiantly and as frequently to establish this Republic. Our children and your children must live here together. And what the Democrats are in favor of is so rearranging these laws as to give every citizen of the American Republic a fair chance in the race of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While we are not in favor of injuring any legitimate business, we do not propose that any business shall injure us, if we can prevent it, by charging two prices for a necessary article of life where it ought to charge but one. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The cost of living by reason of the high tariff and trusts has become so high that it is with extreme difficulty that millions of people manage to live at all.

One other thing: The Republicans always misstate the Democratic position on the subject of reciprocity. I never heard one of them mention it that he did not undertake to convey the impression that Democrats are opposed to reciprocity. That is not true at all. It should not be forgotten that the reciprocity treaty with Canada of 1854 was negotiated under the administration of Franklin Pierce, a Democratic President, and it should never have been abrogated. Democrats negotiated it; Republicans abrogated it. That is the record, and can not be impeached or denied. It shows how the two parties stood in those far-away years.

I will tell you what the Democrats were opposed to, and what we are opposed to yet. We are opposed to that clause in the McKinley bill and the reciprocity growing out of it that undertook to authorize the President and the Senate of the United States to negotiate and adopt treaties affecting the revenues of this country, because we claim that that is a function of the House in a very peculiar manner. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You can not bluff us out by offering buncombe amendments to this bill. One of my distinguished friends dug up a quotation from one of my speeches and put it up out here on a placard, and said I was in favor of the privilege of amendment on all great bills. This bill is peculiar in its nature. It is not an ordinary bill. [Laughter.] That is the plain truth about it. In an ordinary bill you either pass it or beat it fairly and squarely, but in this you attempt to defeat it by pretending to be friendly to it and making amendments to it which must necessarily nullify the agreement.

I have been a friend of reciprocity ever since I commenced making tariff speeches, which is a good while ago, and I expect

to keep it up. When certain Republicans seem to come our way on the subject of reciprocity, I would be an idiot and a craven if I were to turn around and reverse the consistent position I have maintained for the last 25 years.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman has stated two or three times that this bill can not be amended without defeating the bill. He says the Canadian bill is similar to ours. I want to ask him if he is familiar with the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I never saw a copy of it.

Mr. LENROOT. I have a copy of it in my hand, and I say to the gentleman from Missouri that we may amend our bill so as to provide for absolute free trade with Canada, and yet it will not affect the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament to any degree whatever.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not yield for a speech. There is one safe rule of action on the tariff for a Democrat to follow. Whenever you see anything that the American Tariff League or the American Economist are in favor of, fight it.

Mr. BURLESON. The American Protective Tariff League?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; the American Protective Tariff League. Here is a resolution that they passed on the subject of piecemeal tariff revision, offered by Mr. Henry B. Joy, of Michigan:

Whereas we have noted with surprise and regret the drift of sentiment toward what may be called piecemeal tariff revision; and

Whereas it is easy to see why free traders do and should favor a plan which would enable them to attack the different industries one by one, but it is difficult to comprehend how protectionists can support a policy so fraught with injustice and danger to the general body of industrial producers: Therefore

Resolved, That fair and intelligent adjustment of tariff duties is a practical impossibility when dealing with one schedule at a time, for the obvious reason that each and every schedule is more or less correlated with some other schedule or schedules. In this case, while to "divide and destroy" might logically be the free-trade policy regarding piecemeal revision, "the good of the country" should be the motto of protectionists in any measure of tariff revision.

My Democratic brethren, that is fair warning. Whenever the American Protective Tariff League supports a thing, you fight it. Whenever it fights a thing, you support it, and you will be on very safe ground.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to ask this question, not at all by way of controversy, but to get the gentleman's opinion. The theory, of course, of a reciprocity agreement is that by its terms it brings about mutual advantages to each of the parties to it. I can easily understand the advantage that comes to Canada from the admission of its products free into this country. I would like the opinion of the gentleman as to the advantage that would come to the United States from any concession that the agreement gives to our products passing into Canada.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My time is about up and I can not yield to any more interruptions; but I will say that it broadens our market.

Mr. SCOTT. How does it broaden our market?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It gives us a chance to get in where we can not get in now.

Mr. SCOTT. With what, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With our products. I have not the time to state all the things enumerated in the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman refer to manufactured products?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wherever the duty is lower it gives us an advantage.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has said, and very truly, that we do not export into Canada any particular agricultural products that amount to anything. Therefore, if we export anything, it must necessarily be our manufactured products.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman is mistaken. I said no such thing. We export into Canada more agricultural products than they export into the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. You mean leaving cotton out of consideration?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, yes. By leaving cotton out of consideration, and wheat and everything else out of consideration, you make the balance against us. That is the only way you can do it.

Mr. SCOTT. If it is true, and I am sure that it is true, that precisely the same rates will be given to the products of any other country with which England has the most-favored-nation treaty as are given to the United States under this agreement, in what way do we get the preference?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We get the preference by being closer to Canada than any other nation on the face of the earth, separated only by an imaginary line. The gentleman comes from a rich corn country, and so do I, and last year 4,000,000 bushels of American corn was exported to Canada.

Mr. BURLESON. Four million dollars' worth.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; \$4,000,000 worth.

Mr. WEISSE. And \$3,000,000 worth of meat products.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There are many more millions of dollars' worth of American agricultural products exported into Canada which there is not time enough to enumerate, such as meats, animals, barley malt, and even wood pulp and other timber products, as well as seeds to the amount of \$950,000; fruit, \$4,500,000; tobacco, \$1,878,000; and vegetables, \$1,200,000. And by the time you get through with it we will export more into Canada than Canada exports into our country. I am in favor of this bill because it enlarges our markets, because it brings us into closer relations, and because in the days to come it increases the prospects of the consolidation of these two great countries. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 31237) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, had further insisted upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. BULKELEY, and Mr. TALIAFERRO as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire about the status of the time, so that we may balance it.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and one minutes have been consumed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and 81 minutes by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. McCALL. Does that include the time used yesterday, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that it does not include the time used yesterday.

Mr. McCALL. The agreement to-day was apparently that the time to-day should be divided equally; but I think it only fair, as the side which I represent had half an hour more yesterday than the other side, to permit the other side to equalize that time and have half an hour more to-day than we have. I will therefore change the notice that I gave, and I will not move that the committee rise until half past 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that of the balance of the time one-half hour more should be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania than to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCALL. No; I mean to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is entitled to a credit of half an hour from yesterday; but his side has used more time than my side to-day, so that if it is 81 minutes and 101 minutes to-day he is entitled to 10 minutes more, and that would equalize the time. That would give him the half hour to make up for the time that we occupied yesterday.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] explained the difference between prohibiting amendments to bills which he favors and prohibiting amendments to bills which he opposes. You have all seen in the lobby a quotation from his speech of June 7, 1910:

I do not know how long I shall be here, but as long as I am here I intend to fight for the right to amend every section of every great bill which comes into this House, and I do not care a straw whether the Democrats control the House or the Republicans. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 7, 1910.)

What a commentary on his views to-day!

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] frequently contend for full right of amendment in this House. I have heard him over and over again protest against undue haste. Sometimes I have agreed with the words of the gentleman from Missouri. Sometimes I have not agreed with them and have voted against him. It only goes to show the truth of the old adage, Mr. Chairman, that it all depends on whose codfish gets the hook. [Laughter.]

I am not so foolish as to think that any words of mine can stem this panic.

I remember that only six short years ago many of our friends on the Democratic side of this House admitted that the Ameri-

can people once and for all had accepted the principle of protection. To-day even those Republicans who still profess adherence to protection as a principle vie with each other in abjuring it as a practice.

Perchance I myself might join the horde rushing to get behind the fence which marks the political dead line were it not for the fact that long ago I destroyed my bridges behind me. I do not pretend to be any Casabianca standing on the burning deck whence all but he have fled. I am only an ordinary politician who in the past has committed himself, honestly enough, against Canadian reciprocity and in the present finds that his gorge rises when he is invited to swallow the words which he has uttered for a dozen years.

I do not know what humorist was responsible for this reciprocity arrangement between the United States and Canada. I am aware that ridicule is but a poor form of argument, yet I can not refrain from alluding to that clause in the agreement which appears on page 6 of the President's message and reads as follows:

NOTE.—It is understood that fresh fruits to be admitted free of duty into the United States from Canada do not include lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, or pineapples.

Inasmuch as that part of the message is confirmed by the McCall bill we can all thank heaven that at all events the Hudson Bay pineapple industry will not be permitted to break down our home market and that the grapefruit grown on the North Pole will not be permitted to compete with Florida products. [Laughter and applause.]

I cite this passage merely as an illustration of the old proverb that the more haste the less speed. I cite it as an illustration of the carelessness with which the whole agreement has been drawn. Later I intend to show you that our commissioners who negotiated the agreement—if, indeed, we had any commissioners—disregarded the historical experience of the United States in reciprocity treaties of a competitive character, that they disregarded the maxims of the last three Republican national platforms, and that they disregarded the fundamental principles of protection.

NO HOPE OF LOWER PRICES.

It is a significant fact that neither the message of the President, nor the report of the Ways and Means Committee, nor even the speech of the President before the Illinois Legislature holds out the slightest promise to the people looking toward the decreased price of food products. Yet, everyone within the sound of my voice realizes perfectly well that the entire campaign conducted by the press in favor of this reciprocity agreement is not based in any way on the question of advantages to our foreign trade. It is simply and solely predicated on the assertion which is being made to the people that the housekeeper will be enabled to get her supplies at a lower figure. On the one hand, our farmers and our fishermen are assured that they will not be undersold by Canadian competitors. On the other hand, our housekeepers are told that they will reap a benefit from the decreased price of farm products and of fish.

I ask you in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, how it is possible that both of these statements can be true. If the farmer is not to be undersold, how can the consumer buy his farm produce any cheaper unless, perchance, it is thought that the middlemen will be obliged to bear the loss? Yet it is evident that the middleman expects to bear no loss, for I notice that throughout the length and breadth of this country the middlemen, almost without exception, are clamoring for the adoption of this legislation.

I said a minute ago that the Ways and Means Committee and the President had neither of them promised or even indicated the possibility of lower prices of food products. It is true that the Ways and Means Committee in its report takes the ground that at some period, which it sets at 10 years distant, the United States may be unable to produce sufficient wheat to feed our own people, and it indicates the belief that the passage of this bill may in 1921 tend to keep down the price of flour. This view of the Ways and Means Committee is based on the fact that at present we produce a margin of only 17 per cent of wheat and wheat flour beyond what is required for internal use. That might at first sight seem a formidable argument; yet, if it is sound to-day, how much sounder it would have been in 1872, for in that year we produced less than 17 per cent of wheat and wheat flour beyond what was needed for home consumption. How much sounder the argument would have been in 1904, for in that year our surplus production of wheat and wheat flour was but 8 per cent.

As a matter of fact, I do not suppose that the Ways and Means Committee seriously supposes that in 1921, or 1951, for that matter, the United States will be unable to produce enough wheat for its own consumption.

After administering this slight encouragement to the consumer, the committee's report has a reassuring word for the farmer. Speaking of free wheat from Canada, the report says:

And would it decrease the price of our wheat? By no means, for that would be fixed by the world's price. For every bushel that would come in at Manitoba, so long as we raise a surplus, another bushel would go out at New York.

Oh, how beguiling to talk about the world's price and about trade on circles of longitude—terms which the farmer no more understands than does the political economist who utters them. The farmer can, however, at least understand this fact, namely, that each bushel of wheat from Manitoba which drives a bushel of his own wheat abroad through the port of New York imposes on him the cost of transportation and all the expenses incident to seeking a foreign market.

HISTORY OF THIS RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a statement to which I challenge contradiction. I assert it to be the fact that the negotiations for this agreement which were inaugurated last summer were not based on any expectation that the price of food products would be reduced to the consumer in this country. I assert that the motive for their inception was the desire of the President to be relieved of the necessity of imposing the maximum duties against the Dominion of Canada. Under the law of 1909 he was compelled to impose additional duties on the products of the Dominion unless Canada yielded to us as low rates as she yielded to any other nation. But Canada refused to grant us her lowest rates unless we entered into a reciprocity agreement. This, then, was the situation last summer. Either a reciprocity agreement must be made or we must impose additional duties on Canadian products. In the latter event the President was threatened with a tariff war with Canada, and, moreover, with the displeasure of those of our fellow citizens who consider high duties indefensible. This country has thrived on unfulfilled threats of tariff wars, but evidently the President did not view the matter in the light of our past experience, or very likely he felt that this country was in no mood to support him should he be compelled to add 25 per cent to existing duties on Canadian products. If such was his feeling, I think that he was probably correct. At all events, he adjusted himself to the Canadian demand, and the bill which we are to-day considering is the outcome. If my analysis of the situation is correct, it is a curious manifestation of the occasional working of a compulsory maximum and minimum tariff. The imperative imposition of a maximum duty in the case of Canada, instead of being a weapon in our hands, became a weapon by which the Dominion could force from us further concessions.

FREE-TRADE ARGUMENTS.

There is not a single argument in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means which would not be applicable to a proposition for free trade in general, except that the line is drawn in favor of Canada on the violent assumption that the cost of production and the cost of labor are substantially the same in that country as in our own. The President, in his speech before the Illinois Legislature, goes so far as to say that substantially free trade with Canada is the logical conclusion of the last Republican platform, because the conditions of production are practically the same in Canada and in the United States. Now, as a matter of fact, what grounds have the Committee on Ways and Means and the President for any such assertion? Did not the advocates of the treaty of 1854 say exactly the same thing, and yet the facts proved them wrong? Is it not precisely this question which we have intrusted to a tariff board for investigation? Was this tariff board asked for information bearing on the matter?

I assert it to be a fact that the Tariff Board in December, 1910, had substantially completed its investigations with regard to the cost of production of pulp of wood. I also assert it to be a fact that the board was not called upon to produce this evidence during the time when this reciprocity agreement was under consideration by the State Department. I wish to be challenged right here and now by anyone who disputes these statements.

[Here Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts paused. No Member arose in contradiction.]

From my personal knowledge, Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be able to compare the cost of production in western Canada with the cost of production in the western part of the United States.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. COLE. Does the gentleman know anything about the reports of the Tariff Board of the difference of cost in Canada and in the United States?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I might say in reply to the gentleman that I introduced a resolution calling for such information from the Tariff Board. That resolution has been reported favorably from the Committee on Ways and Means, but, owing to the interposition of the question now before this House, the resolution has not yet been acted upon in this Chamber.

WAGES IN CANADA.

As I said a moment ago, I can not speak of western Canada, but I have given some attention to the subject of wages in the Maritime Provinces and in the Province of Quebec so far as they relate to the manufacture of shoes and the products of the fisheries. No one knows what proportion of the inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada dwell east of the Ontario line. No census of the Dominion has been taken since 1901. At that time Canada had 5,300,000 people within its limits and it had only increased in population by half a million during the previous decade. I think it fair to estimate the population of Canada to-day at about 7,500,000, of whom one-third are French Canadians. So far as these French Canadians are concerned, much as I admire them, nevertheless their habits, language, and laws substantially differ from those of any part of our population. Their labor unions are still in a primitive state and their labor laws are scarcely more effective than the labor laws of the Democratic States south of Mason and Dixon's line. Twice a year I visit Canada for somewhat extended periods, and while I have no figures to present other than those relating to the fisheries I have formed a definite impression that the wages of the eastern half of Canada are far less than our own, whether measured by piecework or by hourly wage. However, we have created a tariff board to investigate just such facts as these, and yet it seems that we are not to await its conclusions, but rather we are to lynch the prisoner while the jury is out.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit me a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman's knowledge of the Canadian situation. Will he indicate one item in which there is a great difference, or any difference at all, in actual production—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; I said piecework.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania (continuing). Over that in the United States?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; for example, in the wages paid to cutters per case of shoes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman give the difference, or can he give it?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No; I can not give the exact figures.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Or of any item covered by this agreement?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No; I can not. The Tariff Board can give us a great deal of such information if we wait for their report. On one of the placards hung in the lobby I have shown the difference in the wages paid in the fisheries; that is to say, the difference in wages between Nova Scotia and Gloucester. I think that some time ago I showed the difference between the wages paid for piecework in our shoe factories and in the great McCready shoe factory of Montreal.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman believe that the most effective argument that can be advanced against the consummation of this agreement is to recite in this way, if a difference is indicated? And if a difference does exist, why does not the gentleman or someone else opposing this measure produce the figures in this House?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Because, as has been said again and again in this debate, we have not had the time. No man can collect full statistics in the 10 days which we have been given. I have produced figures showing the difference of wages and expenses in the fisheries.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. FOCHT. I have been told by the president of one of the leading typographical unions that in the cities of Toronto and Buffalo there is a wide difference in the wage scale. Has the gentleman any information on that subject?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I have none; but I should not be surprised if there were a wide difference between Toronto and Buffalo.

Mr. FOCHT. There is.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I am very glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] raised this question. I remember, now, that I have somewhere among my papers a statement showing the pay of sailmakers in Lunenburg.

burg, Nova Scotia, and the scale of the sailmakers' union of Gloucester. I shall insert it in the RECORD as an appendix to these remarks.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? In the testimony taken before the Ways and Means Committee when the Payne tariff bill was made there is no end of testimony as to the difference of wages between Canada and the United States. Up until within the last week or so I never heard anybody deny the difference.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Neither did I.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield on that? If that is the case and the Ways and Means Committee have been in possession of this knowledge, then what is at the base of this complaint that the Tariff Board has not furnished the knowledge which the committee already possesses?

Mr. DALZELL. There are other matters besides wages.

The Tariff Board has not reported to us anything about the duty on pulp, pulp wood, and paper, a matter they have been examining, according to the newspapers, for the last six months, nor upon any other subject that they have had in charge.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 27 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; I yield now, but shall not yield again.

Mr. LONGWORTH. To a very brief question. The gentleman will recall that he himself introduced a resolution asking for a report of the Tariff Board upon this print-paper schedule?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Pulp of wood.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Pulp of wood; and the committee unanimously on the 3d of February reported that resolution and expected the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to bring it up when he found a proper opportunity.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman is mistaken. It was the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. It was a privileged resolution, and it was not competent for the committee to instruct me to bring it up.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understood the gentleman had been instructed.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I can not yield for a discussion in which I have no part.

PRESIDENT TAFT AND THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

Whereas, Mr. Chairman, I could undoubtedly prove by quotations from Republican and Democratic platforms and from Republican and Democratic arguments that the provisions of this agreement are not in accordance with the former professions either of one side of the House or of the other, nevertheless I admit that mere proof of inconsistency is in itself no valid argument. I do not, however, feel that it would be out of place for me to point out the logical result of the President's belief, as expressed in his Illinois speech, to the effect that substantial free trade with Canada is in accordance with the Republican national platform of 1908. He holds that to be the fact, because the Canadian cost of production, as he says, is practically the same as our own. If his view of the platform declaration is to be taken, it will necessitate the imposition of a different rate of duty for each different nation of the whole earth according to the cost of production of each particular article in each one of those nations. Such a series of different tariffs for different countries would engender entangling alliances with a vengeance and would prove the truth of the assertion made in the Democratic campaign book of 1902, to wit:

Reciprocity with one country means a tariff war with other countries. It makes a few friends and many enemies.

THE MAIN ISSUES.

I take it that the questions most at issue between my colleagues on the Republican side and myself are as follows:

First, is this agreement sound when viewed in the light of the theory of protection?

Second, provided that it is sound in itself, will it entail disastrous consequences, owing to the demands of other nations for the same treatment or owing to retaliatory incursions into the protective tariff which we now impose on manufactures?

Third, is it a good bargain, judged solely from the aspect of international trade between the United States and Canada?

As to the question of whether from the point of view of the protectionist this agreement is sound or not depends a good deal on whether the cost of production of the various articles included therein is or is not the same in the two countries. We have created a Tariff Board, gentlemen, to ascertain just such facts. We have no knowledge of the question to-day except that which comes from the evidence presented in 1909 before

the Ways and Means Committee and from the evidence presented last week before that same committee. The evidence in the hands of the Tariff Board is apparently available, but has not been sought. We do know this much, however, that the same evidence which induced Congress in 1909 to place a protective duty on farm products, lumber products, and fish products has never since been contradicted. I confess that I am at loss to understand by what reasoning the Ways and Means Committee arrived at one set of conclusions in 1909 and then in 1911, with precisely the same evidence on hand, arrived at a totally different set of conclusions.

Mr. HARRISON. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there has been an election since that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It is not necessary to yield. The gentleman from New York is an unkind Democrat.

HOW FAR WILL THIS MOVEMENT GO?

I think it safe to say that the inroads into the protective system will not stop with this agreement. The producers of raw material in this country far exceed in number the producers of manufactures. If, then, the duties are removed which protect our producers of raw materials, where are the votes to come from which will protect the duties on manufactures? Is it not certain that the producers of farm products, of lumber, and of fish will join at once with the free traders in annihilating all other duties? Is it not obvious that men who are not protected themselves will refuse to accord protection to others? To deny this proposition is to disregard the plain teachings of history. It was the repeal of the corn laws of Great Britain which broke down the protective system of that nation. The farmers of England (and who can blame them?) declared against the whole system just as soon as they discovered that it was to be applied unequally.

Now, as to whether we may be obliged to extend the provisions of this agreement to France and Germany, I offer no opinion. I am a layman in the matter of international law. But I submit that the exchanges of notes at the time when the minimum duties were prescribed between France and the United States and between Germany and the United States gave those countries at least a reasonable ground for exacting under the most-favored-nation clause the same rates of duty which we grant to Canada. Be that as it may, and be the relative cost of production what it will, when all is said and done about the tariff, I am still of the unpopular belief that for us the most favored nation on earth ought always to be the United States of America. [Applause.]

IS THIS A GOOD BARGAIN?

I can not believe that this agreement has even the merit of being a good bargain. Let me invite your consideration to its provisions. In the first place we are granted no concessions which are not also accorded to Great Britain, while Great Britain is the beneficiary of many concessions not given to us. In some respects, at least, this agreement fails even to give us the lowest rates that are granted by Canada to France. Canada insists on selling us her agricultural products, but she will not allow us to sell her the farm implements which harvest those products. No, indeed! In farm machinery she allows a lower tariff rate to Great Britain. She insists that her lumber shall be admitted to our market, but she refuses to buy from us the axes and saws to fell that lumber. She insists that her fish shall come into the United States free of duty, but she refuses to diminish the bounties which she pays to Canadian fishermen, and she refuses to grant us the privilege of inshore fisheries which she granted us even under the Elgin treaty of 1854.

THE DISASTROUS CANADIAN RECIPROCITY TREATY OF 1854.

Mr. Chairman, I know of but one way of judging of the future and that is by the light of the experience of the past. From 1855 to 1886 we had a reciprocity treaty with Canada, known as the Elgin treaty, practically the same as this agreement which is proposed to-day, with a few more articles included. If anyone doubts that assertion, I invite his attention to the announcement made last week by the Canadian minister of finance, who negotiated this agreement.

The Hon. W. S. Fielding stated in positive terms to the Parliament at Ottawa that this is substantially the treaty of 1854 over again. In effect it provides for a free interchange of the products of the farm, the forests, and the sea, as did the treaty of 1854.

Let me read you the words of Senator Morrill, of Vermont, the best authority we have ever had on the question of reci-

procity. On January 7, 1885, speaking of the result of the treaty of 1854 with Canada, he made the following statement:

Our exports to Canada in 1855 were \$20,828,676, but under the operation of reciprocity then commenced they dwindled in 12 years down to \$15,243,854, while the exports of Canada to the United States increased from twelve million and odd to forty-six million and odd dollars. When the treaty began the balance of trade had been \$8,000,000 annually in our favor and that paid in specie, but at the end the balance against us to be paid in specie in a single year was \$30,000,000. Here was a positive yearly loss of over \$5,000,000 of our export trade and a loss of \$38,000,000 specie, all going to enrich the Canadians at our expense.

I have recently read over the debates which preceded the abrogation of the treaty of 1854. I noticed that some gentlemen who opposed the unconditional cancellation of the treaty took the ground that passions had been aroused in order to prejudice their case. They said that the reason why so many people in the North wished to abrogate the treaty was on account of Canada's hostility to the Union during the Civil War. Personally I doubt that Canadian unfriendliness had much influence on the result, but I commend that argument to those gentlemen who hold that trade treaties conduce to friendship and peace between nations.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, scarcely a man in this House in 1864 and 1865 pleaded for the maintenance of the Elgin treaty. The issue was as to whether the treaty should be abrogated altogether or whether it should be canceled and a board of commissioners appointed to draw up a new treaty. On that issue the House voted by a large majority that it wished no further agreement with Canada at all. The bill went over to the Senate in that shape, and by a vote of 33 to 8 the Senate abrogated the Elgin treaty. Yet our Ways and Means Committee jauntily dismisses the subject by saying that the Elgin treaty was terminated by the lumber interests.

Let us look at the state of affairs which has existed since the abrogation of that treaty. Instead of being millions to the bad in our business relations with Canada, as was the case when the Elgin treaty was terminated in 1866, last year we were no less than \$118,000,000 to the good. The balance of trade in our favor was \$118,000,000. In the 45 years which have elapsed since 1866 our exports to Canada have increased by 1,500 per cent, while the exports of Canada to the United States have increased by only 100 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 18 minutes.

OTHER UNSOUND TREATIES.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The old Canadian treaty was our only great experiment in reciprocity of a competitive kind. It is true that we have enacted two other treaties providing for reciprocity in competitive articles—the Hawaiian treaty and the Cuban treaty. The Hawaiian treaty violated the Republican theory, which advocates reciprocity in noncompetitive articles only, but its purpose was to prepare the way for a treaty of annexation. As a political measure it may have been wise; as an economical measure it was a mistake, for in the end it entailed a loss of more than \$12,000,000 in revenue.

To my mind the Cuban treaty is economically unsound, but politically it was an act of charity to those people whom we rescued from the oppression of Spain.

SUMMARY.

Whether or not the Executive is the best judge of revenue legislation, I think, is open to argument, but the fathers did not take that view when they intrusted to the House of Representatives the sole initiative in such matters. I protest against the attitude of the State Department in refusing us the power of amendment, while leaving us solely the power of veto over measures tampering with our revenue laws. Can anyone gain-say the fact that we are asked to surrender to an encroachment of the executive power at the expense of the powers granted us by the Constitution? We are even to be denied the right which was successfully claimed by the Senate of France, for on April 1, 1909, they asserted their privilege of amending the French reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada, and the Canadian Government promptly came to terms.

THE FISHERIES.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit that this problem is far wider than any question of our fisheries. I shall not attempt to convince you of the awful rigor of the blow which you are dealing them, except so far as I shall show the facts by exhibits connected with this speech. I shall show you in the papers which I present that the rate of wages in the Canadian fisheries is far lower than it is at home. I shall show you the condition of affairs which prevailed under the free-fish provisions of the Washington treaty of 1871. I shall show you that during that

period the town of Provincetown was reduced to direst extremities and that the town of Gloucester was only saved by the phenomenal catch of its mackerel fleet, now fast disappearing from the seas. I call your attention once more to the fact that by this proposed agreement you open to free competition all our New England fishery products, and yet you still retain a duty on the vessels, the sails, the cordage, the nets—in fact, on everything which our fisheries use.

I shall not dispute the assertion of my opponents that the fish industry of New England is not large and that the number of men in its employ is but 22,000, outside of the packing and canning establishments. Since when was the size of an industry the true measure of its need of protection? Since when was it the American policy to ruin men merely because they are weak? I admit at once that the industry is not profitable. In all its history of nearly 300 years no man in Gloucester has made sufficient profits from the sea to retire with a competency.

GLOUCESTER'S GHOSTS.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; but the highest authority in this land says that "Gloucester is seeing ghosts." Oh, it is easy for men whose livelihood is not imperiled to assert that other men are unnecessarily alarmed; yet it is true that "Gloucester is seeing ghosts." She is seeing the ghosts of the men who saved the Continental Army after the battle of Long Island. She is seeing the ghosts of those same fishermen of Gloucester and Marblehead as they battled with the ice in the Delaware River when they safely brought Washington and his little army to turn the tide of defeat at the Battle of Trenton. Gloucester is seeing the ghosts of her old Revolutionary heroes. If they were to arise in this House to-day, would not their pallid lips denounce in deep anathemas the ingratitude of republics?

Gloucester is seeing the ghosts of the thousands of brave men who have given their lives in shipwreck and in storm to build up this Nation. Those are the ghosts she sees, not the petty ghosts of a penny gained and a penny lost, which disturb the dreams of the merchant in his countinghouse.

GLOUCESTER'S DEFIANCE.

You gentlemen, chambers of commerce,
You experts in loss and in gain,
Is a call to your wallet triumphant
And a call to your manhood in vain?
As you sit in your armchairs of leather,
What's the wreck of a schooner to you?
What to you are the tears of the orphans
Or the moans of the wives of the crew?

In your damnable ledger and journal
Do you carry the dead on your roll?
Can you calculate courage in dollars?
What's the price of a fisherman's soul?
You add to the trader's abundance,
To him shall be given, you say,
God help the poor wight who has nothing!
Even that shall be taken away.

As he drifts to his death out on Georges,
As he's caught by the storm off La Have,
When the fog closes in on his dory
And he knows that the sea is his grave,
He will think of your mean little profits,
He'll remember your white-livered lies;
But he'll go like a man to his Maker
And he'll laugh you to scorn as he dies.

[Great applause.]

APPENDIX A.

Platform promises.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL PLATFORM, 1900.

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL PLATFORM, 1904.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL PLATFORM, 1908.

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN BOOK, 1902.

Reciprocity looks like free trade, but tastes like protection. It is really a new sugar coating prepared by the Republican tariff doctors for many patients who are refusing to take their protection pills straight.

Reciprocity is based upon the same false theories as is protection, and, like protection, is a sham and a humbug, and to most people has been and will ever continue to be a delusion and a snare.

Reciprocity with one country means a tariff war with other countries. It makes few friends and many enemies.

Reciprocity legislation confers dangerous and perhaps unconstitutional powers upon the President.

APPENDIX B.

Comparison of wages in the fisheries.

[From evidence before Ways and Means Committee, Feb. 2, 1911.]

	Gloucester, Mass.	Lunenburg, Nova Scotia.
Captains.....	\$100 to \$125.....	\$60 to \$65.
Cooks and mates.....	\$60 to \$70.....	\$35.
Men before the mast.....	\$30 to \$35.....	\$22.
Sailmakers.....	18 cents per yard.....	8 cents per yard.
Carpenters.....	\$2.50 to \$3.....	\$1.75.

APPENDIX C.

Comparison of cost of building and equipping a fishing schooner.

[From evidence before Ways and Means Committee, Feb. 2, 1911.]

Schooner <i>Clintonia</i> , of Gloucester, Mass., built in 1907; cost ready for sea.....	\$15,500
Schooner <i>Clintonia</i> , of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, built in 1907; cost ready for sea.....	9,400

These schooners were sister ships in every respect.

APPENDIX D.

Profits in the Gloucester fisheries from April, 1909, to April, 1910—duty three-fourths cent per pound.

Net profits of Gorton-Pew Fish Co. fleet.....	\$33,578
Net loss of Gorton-Pew Fish Co. fleet if salt cod had sold, on the average, at one-fourth cent per pound lower than it actually sold.....	2,964

APPENDIX E.

THE NEW ENGLAND FISHERIES UNDER THE OPERATION OF THE FREE FISH PROVISIONS OF THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

[From Boston Traveller, Oct. 30, 1884.]

There sailed from this port (Provincetown) last spring 75 vessels to the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and to the Gulf of St. Lawrence cod-fishing grounds. In tonnage it was the largest and costliest fleet that ever sailed from here to these grounds, including one vessel larger than ever before cleared from an Atlantic port in the United States and several whose cost exceeded \$15,000 each. Being successful, they brought back to this port the largest aggregate catch ever returned here in a single season, amounting to 144,360 quintals or 8,084 tons of cod. Notwithstanding this successful catch, the average prices obtained ruled so low that the cost of catching, curing, and placing their fish upon the market exceeded the prices for which they were sold.

From a careful examination of the expense and assets of the voyages of vessels belonging to nine representative firms and parties in this place, and which were made in vessels which obtained full cargoes, it appears the average cost of catching, curing, and marketing was \$3 per quintal, and that the average price realized from sales was \$2.64 per quintal. Hence, THOSE OF THE CREWS SHIPPED ON SHARES DID NOT RECEIVE ANY COMPENSATION FOR THE VOYAGE, but, being chargeable for certain outfits, provisions, and wages of those of the crews not on shares, incurred serious additional loss. THE SHARESMEN OF NOT 5 OF THE 75 VESSELS OF THIS FLEET WILL REALIZE A DOLLAR OF NET RECEIPTS FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE VOYAGES. NOR DO THE OWNERS OF THESE VESSELS FARE ANY BETTER.

By contract between owners and sharesmen the former should realize a very limited net return on the voyage cited, but as a rule the latter are unable to liquidate their indebtedness and the vessels are held for it. Hence, only in a few exceptional cases will owners realize any net compensation. They have consequently lost earnings, insurance, and taxes on last season's operations.

All offers from dealers here to merchants in that and other western cities, even at unremunerative rates, have met the uniform answer, "WE ARE SUPPLIED WITH ENGLISH FISH AT LESS RATE THAN YOU OFFER."

GLOUCESTER, MASS.

[Evidence of Capt. Sylvanus Smith before the Ways and Means Committee Feb. 2, 1911.]

Capt. SMITH. The cod fisheries? In the beginning of that treaty the codfish business was good. The vessels that came up there sold their cargoes at about \$4 or \$4.12½ to \$4.25 per 100 pounds in the vessels.

They went up that year into what we call the Cape towns, around the western shore of Nova Scotia, and built some 60 or 70 vessels. By the time they got them going there was an overproduction of fish or something and the price of fish went down. I took in fish on my premises for \$1.45 per 100 pounds. We sold fish for \$1.75 a quintal—that is, 114 pounds—dried. We shipped cargoes of fish to Surinam that we did not get enough out of to pay the freight and the other expenses—the commission, etc.

That was the condition of things during that treaty—the Washington treaty. We had one thing that saved us. The mackerel fishery has since been annihilated, but we then had a good catch of mackerel that helped us out. DURING THAT TREATY QUITE A LARGE NUMBER OF FIRMS SOLD THEIR VESSELS OR WENT OUT OF BUSINESS.

THE SALT MACKEREL FLEET SAVED GLOUCESTER UNDER THE WASHINGTON TREATY—IT CAN NOT DO SO AGAIN.

Average American catch of salt mackerel during last eight years of treaty.....barrels per annum.....	308,996
Total American catch of salt mackerel in 1910.....barrels.....	3,395

PRICES UNDER WASHINGTON TREATY PROVIDING FOR FREE FISH.

[From books of Cunningham & Thompson, Gloucester, Mass.]

Prices of salt fish from Grand Banks trips landed in Gloucester during the reciprocity period, including the years from 1874 to 1885, inclusive. Dates show arrival of the vessels.

	Large.	Small.
Aug. 30, 1874.....	\$3.00	\$1.50
July 25, 1875.....	2.62½	1.80
June 18, 1876.....	2.50	1.25
June 10, 1876.....	2.50	1.25
Aug. 23, 1876.....	2.50	1.25
Sept. 27, 1876.....	3.00	1.50
May 22, 1877.....	2.50	1.25
July 23, 1877.....	2.50	1.25
September, 1877.....	2.50	1.50
October, 1877.....	2.50	1.25
August, 1878.....	2.00	1.00
Do.....	2.00	1.00
September, 1878.....	2.18	1.50
April, 1879.....	2.20	1.00
August, 1879.....	2.00	1.00
September, 1879.....	2.00	1.00
April, 1880.....	2.75	1.37
June, 1880.....	2.37½	1.25
September, 1880.....	2.50	1.25
March, 1882.....	3.00	1.50
April, 1882.....	2.75	1.37½
June, 1882.....	2.62½	1.31½
August, 1882.....	3.87½	2.00
September, 1882.....	3.87½	2.00
July, 1883.....	2.75	1.75
September, 1883.....	2.50	1.25
Do.....	2.62½	1.31½
August, 1884.....	2.25	1.05½
October, 1885.....	2.00	1.00

Price of salt fish before Washington treaty averaged about \$4 (currency) per 100 pounds.

Price of salt fish last year (April, 1909, to April, 1910) averaged about \$3.50 per 100 pounds.

APPENDIX F.

Number of men employed in New England fisheries in 1908, exclusive of packing and canning establishments.

[From Statistical Abstract of United States.]

Connecticut.....	2,147
Maine.....	6,861
Massachusetts.....	11,577
Rhode Island.....	1,493
Total.....	22,078

Mr. McCALL. I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset to congratulate my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] upon his most able and eloquent speech. I want also at this time to extend to him my thanks for the great honor that he has done me in placing me among that galaxy of statesmen and near statesmen which have adorned what has come to be known as the "Chamber of Horrors," just outside this door. I want to say to the gentleman that so far as the quotation from my remarks is concerned I stand by it to-day just as much as I did then.

Now, I think it would be only fair to me, under the circumstances, to return the compliment, to quote, not literally but in substance, the remarks once made in this House by the gentleman from Massachusetts. He has said that in this instance it depends upon "whose codfish gets the hook." I want to show that the gentleman has been consistent ever since he has been in this House for the protection of his particular codfish. In the Associated Press account of the maiden speech delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which I read with feelings of the most intense admiration, I observed—and this, Mr. Chairman, was on the subject of the pure-food bill—the following: Mr. GARDNER opposed the bill and declared that it would interfere—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Let me say to the gentleman, not the bill, but the paragraph.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; he opposed the codfish paragraph. He declared that it would interfere materially with many legitimate industries. Boracic acid, he said, was used to preserve the codfish and would probably, under the terms of the bill, be held deleterious to health by the Government chemists. In conclusion, he said that there was a great deal of humbug about the outcry against adulterated food. If we ate adulterated food, he said, we did not want to know it, any more than we wanted to know the unhealthy conditions with which we are sometimes surrounded. He said he believed the anti-spitting and other so-called health ordinances were overdone. At this point the House adjourned. [Laughter.]

I have always felt that the House upon that occasion took too drastic an action. [Laughter.] It must be remembered that that speech was the maiden speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts. It deals with those objects which were most dear to his heart—with the codfish of his district. He was then protecting the codfish against those who desired to purify him. [Laughter.] To-day he is protecting the codfish against those who desire to wean him away from the port of Gloucester, where he was born and where he ought to remain.

I regret very much—no one more, Mr. Chairman—that this bill should have come before this House with a divided report. On the minority side the vote is six to one. However, I permit myself to doubt, if they had not been bound by caucus action, whether the vote would not have more closely approximated four to three. Upon our side the vote is six to six. The committee is divided against itself, and I lament that such a condition should occur among members of my party, and especially upon a matter of such immense importance as this. But inasmuch as we were not in any sense bound by caucus action, the votes of the individual members of the Ways and Means Committee must be taken as an expression of their individual opinion. Now, the principal ground of opposition upon this side of the Chamber to this bill is that it is a violation of the fundamental principle of protection. This is the conscientious belief, I have no doubt, of very many able men, and their opinion is entitled to the most respectful consideration, not only of members of their party but of the country.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES] yesterday and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] this morning made most able speeches in opposition to this bill, and it seems to me they have exhausted the subject upon their side of the question. And yet while there are no men in this House whose opinions are entitled to greater weight, whose conscientious devotion to principle, whose integrity of purpose are more absolutely unquestioned, I take issue with them upon the logic of their conclusions, that this bill is a violation of the principle of protection. I am convinced, as those of us upon this side of the House in favor of Canadian reciprocity as established by this bill, that it does not violate the principle of protection either in the letter or in the spirit. If we are to hold that this agreement does violate the principle of protection in the letter, we must assume as a matter of fact the duties in the main as between ourselves and Canada are reduced below the protective point. That proposition I deny. But even if it is true, in order to show that this bill violates the principle of protection in the spirit, we must hold that there is no difference between the changing of duties to carry out the treaty of reciprocity and the changing of duties in a general revision of the tariff. I am not willing to admit the force of either of these two propositions. In the first place, I believe that few, if any, of the duties in this bill are in fact reduced below the true protective point, that is to say, the difference in the cost of production here and in Canada. In the second place, even if it were true that some of these duties were reduced below that point, I am not willing to admit that the principle which should govern in a general revision of the tariff is at all the same as the principle which should govern in a treaty of reciprocity with one particular nation.

The competition which our producers might have cause to fear must inevitably come from that part of Canada which lies close to our northern border. If the people of Canada were of an inferior race, if they were willing to dispense with the ordinary comforts of living, if their standard of living were substantially different from our own, it might well be true that the letting down of the bars would result in the flooding of our markets with the products of low-priced labor.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I must decline to yield at present. A little further along I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. Everyone knows, however, that our neighbors across the border are a superior people, similar in all respects, in education and mode and manner of living, to our people on this side of the line. In short, I think it can be safely said that in the cost of producing the principal articles in which we compete with Canada, certainly so far as that part of Canada near the Canadian border is concerned, there is very little if any difference between us.

Mr. DAWSON. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I must decline to yield; and so, judging by the definition of protection as laid down in our last platform, that the duty shall equal the difference in the cost of production of articles here and abroad with a fair profit to the home producer, this principle will not be violated in the letter by the placing of a large number of the important things which Canada and we ourselves produce upon our mutual free list.

But even if it were true that some of the duties provided on competing articles in this bill are as a matter of fact less than the actual difference in their cost of production here and in Canada, I deny that the fixing of those duties in a reciprocity agreement violates in the spirit the true principle of protection.

I deny that there is any parallel between a friendly trade agreement that we may make, as now, with a nation of 7,000,000 people and a general tariff schedule that we may have against a billion and a quarter of people of all the nations of the earth.

Gentlemen upon this side of the House have said that they favor reciprocity, but that that reciprocity must be confined to noncompetitive products. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] this morning went into that proposition at some length. Now, I would like to know—I would like to have any gentleman in this House tell me—one single article either grown, produced, or manufactured in Canada that is not grown, produced, or manufactured in this country.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Furs.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Ice?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Furs.

Mr. MANN. Furs are grown in this country.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to suggest that there is an immense number of furs in this country, and in Alaska, too. So that, according to that theory of reciprocity, anyone who abides by it, as does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is forced to admit that there is no such thing and can be no such thing as a reciprocal agreement between this country and Canada. It is a perfect farce to say that we can have a reciprocal agreement with Canada not on competing articles.

Mr. PRINCE. Will the gentleman yield just for one question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I must decline, as I only have a very short time, and I will yield afterwards, if I have any time. So that the only good that could possibly result from any reciprocity agreement with Canada must be with regard to competing articles. If we of the Republican Party who believe in protection are to oppose any reciprocity treaty, whether we may derive immense benefit from it or not, whether a country like Canada may make immense concessions to us or not, simply because the duty on some few articles may be reduced as between us below the protective point, we might as well abandon the whole theory of reciprocity. That, as a Republican, I am unwilling to do.

I believe that protection and reciprocity ought to go hand in hand, and I believe that the principles of the leaders of our party who have favored in the past and who now favor both protection and reciprocity are not violated by this agreement.

What does protection mean? Does it mean that high duties must be imposed upon every article produced in this country under all circumstances, whether it needs it or not? If that is the meaning of protection, it seems to me that we must repudiate the protective plank in our last Republican platform, a plank which the gentleman from Pennsylvania helped to make, and must go back to a more ancient authority than that to confirm our position. Does it mean that in the making of a reciprocal trade agreement with any one country duties upon competing articles must remain as high against it as they are against all other countries, regardless of conditions? If that is what protection means, then it is a doctrine so hidebound and inelastic, so unresponsive to the march of events and the progress of nations, that it will be hard for those of us who believe in it to keep it from falling. My theory of protection, and, I believe, that of the majority of men who vote the Republican ticket to-day, is a policy that will adapt itself at all times to changed conditions; which will encourage industries that need encouraging; which will protect producers which need protection; which will maintain at the present level the wages of American workmen employed in producing those articles; but not one which will necessarily maintain forever an impregnable wall around this country, and especially across the Canadian frontier, which can benefit no one at all, except possibly only a few who may be able to hide behind some of the higher parts of the wall and, by combination among themselves, inflate prices beyond a reasonable level.

Such a theory of protection, it seems to me, accords exactly with that laid down in our last party platform. It accords exactly with the principle involved in the creation of a permanent tariff board, which this House, by an almost unanimous Republican vote, passed only the other day; and, finally, it accords exactly, in my judgment, with the principle involved in the bill which is now before us.

Holding, as I do, this theory of protection, I should oppose as vigorously as anyone on this side of the House, not excepting the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]—and I can say no more—the lowering of any duty upon any competing article in the general tariff below the difference in its cost of production here and abroad, because that would inevitably result either in the complete annihilation of that industry in this country or else in the reduction of the wages of the men employed in it. But this bill is not a revision of the general tariff. It is merely the change of a few duties in conformity with a trade agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to have 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], who controls one-half of the time, has requested the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] for five minutes more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The understanding was 10 minutes, but I will try to get through in five.

Mr. PRINCE. Will the gentleman now yield to a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. In five minutes I can not yield. If I can have 10 minutes I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. PRINCE. I ask that the gentleman have 10 minutes.

Mr. GAINES. I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] will yield more time to the gentleman, inasmuch as he is a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] yield to a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRINCE. A few days ago I saw the reports of the price of grain, and I have been watching it very closely since this reciprocity question has been up. As I said to you, a few days ago the price of wheat in Chicago was 95 cents a bushel, and in the Washington Times of February 14, 1911, July wheat is quoted at 90½ cents. Has your reciprocity discussion anything to do with the fall of the price of wheat?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will reply to the gentleman from Illinois that I do not know. I will be perfectly frank with him.

The foundation of the opposition to this bill is based, it seems to me, on the same theory that it would be if this were a general tariff revision. I again repeat that it is in no sense a general tariff revision. The question of the principles of a general tariff are not involved. The fact that it is proposed to have the free interchange of some commodities between ourselves and our neighbors on the north by no means presupposes that we are to have free interchange of these commodities with any other country under the sun. If, by chance, in exchange for concessions that Canada makes us, and for the benefits which the American people are to receive, some duties may be lowered below the protective point to-day as between us and Canada, it by no means presupposes that duties may in the future be lowered below the protective point as against any other country under the sun.

The agreement upon which this bill was passed was negotiated under the direction of a Republican President, elected upon the Republican platform of 1908. Is it to be supposed, especially in view of what he has been saying in the past few days, that he is ready to repudiate that platform? The actual negotiations were conducted by an able Republican statesman, now premier and formerly Senator from the great Republican State of Pennsylvania. Is it to be supposed that he has abandoned the principle of protection? Gentlemen criticize some of the provisions of this bill. They have offered amendments in the committee; they propose to offer amendments on this floor, well knowing that a change of any item, no matter how insignificant, may result, and probably will result, in the entire proposition falling to the ground. They point to certain inconsistencies in the agreement. They complain that it was badly negotiated. It may be true that the agreement is not in all respects ideal. The President himself has recently referred to some changes that he hoped could have been made. In a speech delivered by him on Saturday in Springfield, Ill., he stated positively that he had given the negotiators great leeway in lowering or placing articles on the free list.

He stated he had favored the placing of meat on the free list, and the reason it was not done was because the Canadian negotiators objected. Now, when we realize that the Canadian tariff is 3 cents, and that the tariff in the Payne law is only 1½ cents, we can see that Canada has yielded more than we have. They have yielded more than 100 per cent of their duty, and we less than 15 per cent. And so in many items of the bill our negotiators were compelled to yield in many instances to the judgment of the negotiators on the other side. We must realize that this trade agreement is a contract. These negotiations were conducted by representatives of both countries of widely

diversified interests. They had to agree upon everything or nothing. They had to give and take. The proposition now before us is a great administration measure—

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not yield. For us in the coordinate legislative branch it is only fair to assume when we are called upon to enact this agreement into law that the executive branch was animated in the negotiation of this agreement by patriotic motives, and that the results are under all the circumstances the best attainable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If I can have five minutes more I think I can finish in that time.

Mr. McCALL. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is extended five minutes in order to finish.

Mr. SWASEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not yield. I regret it very much, but I can not yield if I am to finish in the time allotted me.

It is not for us to determine whether every particular detail is just what we think it should be. The question before us is simply whether the agreement as a whole is of benefit to the American people. If we so believe, it is our duty to vote it all up. If we do not so believe, it is our duty to vote it all down. At this point our functions begin and determine.

I urge gentlemen on both sides of this House who are opposed, honestly opposed, to Canadian reciprocity to content themselves with voting against its passage. That is their right; it is their duty, if they conscientiously believe either that its passage is not in the interest of the American people or that it violates the principles to which they are devoted. But do not, under the guise of amendment—in the adoption of which you may or may not be insincere—attempt in an indirect way to prevent the legislative enactment of this trade agreement, for be well assured that the adoption of any amendment, no matter how insignificant, as I said before, may and will in all probability cause this whole proposition to fall to the ground.

This is a case where some of our ablest and most time-tried leaders are in complete disagreement. So far as the question of Canadian reciprocity is concerned, we are at the parting of the ways. For my part I have had no doubt as to the course which I should pursue. With a high respect for their ability, for their integrity of purpose, for the services they have rendered in the past in the cause of Republicanism, I am unable in this instance to align myself with great leaders like DALZELL and HEYBURN and CANNON, and I propose to follow, and shall follow, upon this proposition the leadership of PAYNE and ROOSEVELT and TAFT. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MALBY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 32473) for the relief of sufferers from famine in China.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 31353. An act for the relief of F. W. Mueller;

H. R. 31600. An act to authorize the erection upon the Crown Point Lighthouse Reservation, N. Y., of a memorial to commemorate the discovery of Lake Champlain; and

H. R. 31931. An act authorizing the Ivanhoe Furnace Corporation, of Ivanhoe, Wythe County, Va., to erect a dam across New River.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report (No. 2163) and statement on the bill (H. R. 31237) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, for printing under the rules.

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 31237) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14, 15, 26, and 32.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "at," following said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the word "of;" and transpose the words "in the Yellowstone National Park," so that they will follow the word "chapel," preceding said amendment, thus changing the portion of the proviso which relates to the proposed Fort Yellowstone chapel so that it will read as follows:

"Provided further, That \$25,000 of the sum herein appropriated may be used for the construction and completion of a chapel in the Yellowstone National Park on or near the military reservation of Fort Yellowstone."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in said amendment, insert the words "and fifty thousand nine hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following: "On and after the passage of this act every line officer on the active list below the grade of colonel who has lost in lineal rank through the system of regimental promotion in force prior to October 1, 1890, may, in the discretion of the President and subject to examination for promotion as prescribed by law, be advanced to higher grades in his arm up to and including the grade of colonel, in accordance with the rank he would have been entitled to hold had promotion been lineal throughout his arm or corps since the date of his entry into the arm or corps to which he permanently belongs: *Provided*, That officers advanced to higher grades under the provisions of this act shall be additional officers in those grades: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall operate to interfere with or retard the promotion to which any officer would be entitled under existing law: *And provided further*, That the officers advanced to higher grades under this act shall be junior to the officers who now rank them under existing law when these officers have reached the same grade;" and the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 23, and 49, the committee of conference has been unable to agree.

J. A. T. HULL,
GEO. W. PRINCE,
WM. SULZER,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
JAS. P. TALLAFERRO,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

Amendment No. 1 changes the language from "War Department" to "Chief of Staff," and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 2, under the appropriation for the signal service of the Army, makes \$25,000 immediately available, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 change the phraseology, with a proviso for the operation of aeroplanes and other aerial machines, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7 removes the stoppage against officers who received pay for higher commands during the Spanish War, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8 corrects the total, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10 provides for clerks at posts commanded by general officers, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 11 confines the appropriation to the increased pay of retired officers assigned to active duty, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12 makes clear what was intended by the original law as to veterinary surgeons, and gives them the right of the retired pay of a second lieutenant, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 13 relates to travel allowance to enlisted men on discharge, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 14 relates to clothing not drawn due to enlisted men on discharge, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15 relates to mileage, and the Senate recedes. Amendment No. 16 strikes out the word "Provisional," which is no longer proper, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 17 is a correction of the total pay for certain officers, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 18 relates to Army paymasters' clerks, and the committee report a disagreement.

Amendment No. 19 extends the appropriation for encampment maneuvers until the end of the fiscal year 1913, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 20 is a correction of the amount to be paid as reimbursement to the adjutant general of Missouri.

Amendment No. 21 makes this payment as a settlement in full, and the House recedes from both amendments.

Amendment No. 22 relates to an increased amount for the Coast Artillery Militia, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 23 relates to the increased officers, and the committee report a disagreement.

Amendment No. 24 relates to subsistence of competitors in the national rifle match, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 25 inserts the word "hereafter," so as to make the provision permanent law, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 26 relates to contracts not to be performed within 60 days by the Commissary General, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 27 strikes out certain language which is now permanent law, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29 are simply punctuation, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 30 relates to the appropriation for the purchase of a remount station in the State of Virginia, and amendment No. 31 restores the amount to what was reported by the House committee, and the House recedes from both amendments.

Amendment No. 32 relates to sales of furniture to officers on the active list not occupying public quarters, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 33 increases the amount provided for a chapel at Fort Yellowstone, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 34 relates to the location of the chapel, and the House recedes and agrees to the same with an amendment.

Amendment No. 35 relates to the building of a chapel at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and makes \$221,700 immediately available for barracks and quarters, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37 are punctuation, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 38 inserts the word "hereafter" in the proviso relating to the accommodations on Army transports, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 39 is verbal, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 40 extends the privileges on the transports to secretaries of the Young Men's Christian Association, and also permits, under certain conditions, the shipment of goods to Guam under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 41 inserts the word "hereafter," and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 42 removes the suspension in the accounts of quartermasters for certain years, for hire of motor vehicles, repair, operating, and maintaining the same, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 43 is the total amount appropriated for water and sewers at military posts, and the House recedes from its disagreement and agrees to the same with an amendment striking out "sixty-seven" and inserting "fifty."

Amendment No. 44 relates to the amount of money necessary to be used at the Fort D. A. Russell target and maneuver reservation, Wyoming, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 45 is simply a change in the language in the provision appropriating for Fort Meade, S. Dak., and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 46 increases the appropriation \$50,000 for roads in Alaska, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 47 provides the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, assign retired officers to work in Alaska, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 48 removes the suspension against the accounts for the transportation of officers' authorized horses for 1909 and 1910, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 49 relates to the establishment of a dental corps in the Army, and the committee report a disagreement.

Amendment No. 50 authorizes the release of a strip of land for street purposes to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 51 is verbal, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 52 strikes out the words "until expended" and makes the appropriation for field artillery for the Organized Militia available until the end of the fiscal year 1913, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 53: The House recedes from its disagreement, and agrees to the same with an amendment making more clear the limitation of the promotion of the officers affected.

J. A. T. HULL,
GEO. W. PRINCE,

Conferees on part of the House.

FAMINE IN CHINA.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report (No. 2164) and statement on the bill (H. R. 32473) for the relief of the sufferers from famine in China, for printing under the rules.

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 32473) for the relief of the sufferers from famine in China, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

J. A. T. HULL,
F. C. STEVENS,
JAMES HAY,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
JAS. P. TALLAFERRO,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The House recedes from its disagreements to all of the amendments of the Senate. The amendments of the Senate limit the appropriation for one trip of a transport only, and provides \$50,000 to cover the expense.

J. A. T. HULL,
F. C. STEVENS,
JAS. HAY,

Managers on the part of the House.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, most of the manufactories of pulp and paper on this continent are in the United States. The bulk of the raw material which goes into the manufacture of ground-wood and cheap print paper is in Canada. A considerable portion of the timber in Canada available for this purpose, which is spruce wood, is on private lands, but the great bulk of the Canadian spruce timber which can be made available for the manufacture of cheap paper is on public lands owned largely by the Provinces and called "Crown lands." In some of the Provinces they are owned by the Dominion Government.

When I shall have occasion to refer to pulp and paper in my remarks I shall refer to the description in the bill and in the agreement, which is more particular than that. The proposition in the agreement is in effect that pulp and paper coming from Canada, manufactured from pulp wood cut on private lands, shall be at once admitted free of duty. The Crown-land pulp wood or timber is sold under restrictions which either provide in the main that the wood shall be manufactured into a finished product in the Dominion of Canada, or else puts an extra charge for the cutting of the timber when exported from Canada, or in one case at least from the Province. We propose by the agreement to admit pulp and paper which comes from the private-land timber free of duty and for the present leaving a duty of \$5.75 a ton on cheap paper and a little more on the higher grade of paper, and \$1.67 a ton on ground wood and a little more on other forms of pulp when made from timber cut on the Crown lands where there is any restriction placed upon the exportation.

The agreement further provides that when we admit from Canada all of the pulp and paper described in the agreement into the United States free of duty, then Canada shall admit free of duty the same articles going from the United States into Canada.

Mr. SWASEY. One moment—

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. SWASEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Not until I finish this statement. Then I will be very glad to yield. Perhaps I will cover what the gentleman has in mind. I think I will cover the subject if I have no interruptions for a moment.

Mr. SWASEY. I think the gentleman will if he will allow me to ask him questions.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is very complimentary. I think I will not yield under the conditions.

It is not likely that the agreement that we may ship paper into Canada free of duty will ever be of great value to us. Under the agreement, if this bill is passed, we at once admit paper and pulp from the private lands of Canada free of duty. If the Canadian Provinces remove their restrictions on the exportation of Crown-land pulp wood, so that we admit all the paper and pulp described in the agreement coming from Canada free of duty, then the Canadians are to admit our paper and pulp free of duty into Canada. If the business of paper and pulp making is largely transferred to Canada, as some gentlemen believe will be the result of any reciprocal agreement with Canada, it will make but little difference whether we have or have not the right to admit paper and pulp into Canada free of duty.

It is said that this agreement is somewhat one-sided. In a way it is. The value of the agreement to the United States depends upon whether it is necessary for us to obtain from Canada pulp wood for the benefit of our mills. Most of the spruce pulp wood in the United States is contained within the confines of the State of Maine, which has a large quantity; and yet it has been estimated by gentlemen who have made a special study of this subject that all of the spruce wood in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains would be entirely consumed, at the present rate of consumption, within the course of 10 years. Canada has the great supply of pulp wood, reaching into her forests north almost beyond our knowledge and reaching to the east and into the west. We have the consumption of pulp and paper. We have to-day the manufacturers of pulp and paper. They have the raw material out of which the product must be made. They have it within their power to force eventually all of the manufacture of cheap print paper and ground pulp wood into Canada, if they insist upon it. This proposition is to encourage them to permit us to obtain the supply of pulp wood for our manufacturers and for our consumption, and in exchange to give them free access to our markets in those cases where they put no restriction upon the exportation of their pulp wood.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Would a question disturb the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. I would be very glad to yield first to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. SWASEY].

Mr. SWASEY. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if, by this agreement or reciprocity compact, the pulp and paper industry in the United States get anything they do not already have—the right to import spruce wood from private lands free of duty.

Mr. MANN. That is a fair question, and I will answer it. Under the terms of the agreement the paper manufacturers of the United States at present get nothing which they do not now have.

Mr. SWASEY. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. But under the terms of this proposition they get the prospect of raw material in the future, which without it they will soon not have. [Applause.] We can not force the Canadian Government, nor can the Canadian Government itself directly force the Provinces which are the owners of the Crown lands, to permit the exportation of pulp wood. All we have the power to do is to offer to them something which they want, in order to encourage them to give us what we want. Under the terms of this agreement—

Mr. SWASEY. In connection with the other questions, where you said that we gained nothing by this reciprocity—

Mr. MANN. I did not say that.

Mr. SWASEY. We do not gain anything.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may ask his question, but he ought not to undertake to quote me.

Mr. SWASEY. While we have no additional right to import pulp wood under this reciprocity agreement over what we have to-day, do we not give up the \$5.75 duty on every ton of paper that is imported from the private lands of Canada?

Mr. MANN. Well, I am surprised that the gentleman from Maine, who knows so much in reference to pulp wood—and I say it honestly—does not know that the duty on paper coming from private land is not \$5.75, but only \$3.75 a ton as now collected.

Mr. SWASEY. Let me ask the gentleman if we do not have a countervailing proposition of \$2 unless they yield certain things under the tariff law, and has not the gentleman from Illinois said since he started to speak that the duty was \$5.75?

Mr. MANN. The duty now collected on paper coming from private land is \$3.75 a ton. Under this agreement we propose to give it up. The duty collected from print paper coming from Crown lands is \$5.75. That we propose to retain as a differential against paper made from Crown-land pulp wood in order to bring a natural inducement to remove the restrictions so that they may get the right to import paper free, they giving us the right to import pulp wood without restrictions.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I think the gentleman has made plain one question that I desired to ask. But I desire to be sure that I am right. On the subject of wood pulp the provisions of this agreement would be practically the same as in the Payne tariff law?

Mr. MANN. The provisions of this agreement as to ground wood is precisely the same as in the Payne tariff law as it is construed; I do not think it is a correct construction.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The change is in the granting under this agreement the right to bring in free of duty print paper made from wood taken from private land. Now, one other question. I notice the bill prepared by the gentleman from Illinois, with which I am familiar, provides as a condition of bringing in any product from Canada that all restrictions shall be removed from every importation—

Mr. MANN. I understand the question, and I will answer it in my time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman understands the question, I will go no further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill affecting the revenues of our Government drafted through the channels of diplomacy by our State Department and commissioners representing the Government of Canada. Inasmuch as it affects the revenues, constitutionally it can only originate in the House of Representatives. Since it seeks to promote reciprocal trade relations between the two Governments it is apparent, from the very wording of the bill, that it did not so originate. In its very title it presupposes that an agreement has been reached between the two Governments, and that the House is called on to pass upon the measure in an effort simply to make legal and constitutional a matter which is altogether unlawful and unconstitutional; in fact, there is absolutely no concealment of the purpose for which this law is to be enacted, as the special message sent to Congress by the President is accompanied by the correspondence between the Canadian commissioners and our Secretary of State, reciting in detail the purport of the bill.

At this time it would probably serve no useful purpose to argue with this House that the method of procedure is unconstitutional; that one of the bitterest fought contests in the Constitutional Convention was on the question as to whether a bill affecting the revenues could originate elsewhere than in the House; that even the Senate was deprived of that prerogative. That subject was long debated; and in order to secure the ratification of the Constitution it was deemed wise by its framers that the right to originate legislation affecting the revenues should be placed exclusively in the hands of the House of Representatives, just as the matter of ratifying treaties was left exclusively to the Senate. Hence, my reason for adding, among other things, the following statement in signing the minority report on this measure:

"The Constitution provides that revenue bills must originate in the House, and the President shall have the right to veto. The principle of this proposition exacts that the President shall originate revenue bills and that the House shall have the power of the veto. This abdication of power is obnoxious to my views, is unpatriotic and illogical."

Nor would it serve any useful purpose to repeat what was generally discussed when the Cuban reciprocity measure was pending. However, I want to state that, in the adoption of this revenue bill, originating, as it does, with the Executive, the House is losing one of its foremost prerogatives; and that the Senate, by permitting the House to assume jurisdiction of indirectly ratifying a treaty, is being deprived of one of its most important rights.

The history of this legislation conclusively shows how easy it is for one branch of the Government to encroach upon the

rights of the other. When the Cuban reciprocity measure passed the House it was with a provision to this effect:

That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that custom duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress originating in said House.

It would seem that, while the House was, in that instance, permitting the Executive to encroach upon its prerogative, it then and there warned the Executive that this encroachment could not be continued. Of course, those of us who were here at that time believed that this warning would be heeded by the Executive or that the House would assert itself; but, since we are now confronted with a similar proposition wherein that prerogative is again usurped by the Executive thrusting upon this House the passage of Canadian reciprocity, with the House impatient to pass it, and, in its manifestation of that impatience, forgetting the admonition which it then gave, it is patent that such is not the case.

But, more than that, while this agreement is being considered during the closing days of the short session, with a crowded calendar in both branches of Congress, the restlessness of its proponents is further manifested, not in conserving the prerogatives of the House, but in suggestions—quasi threatening—of an extra session should Congress fail to comply with the Executive's attitude in this respect. The impatience of the proponents of this measure is manifested by the undue haste and the scant consideration this bill has received. I merely call attention to this fact to the end that this phase of it may not pass unnoticed, and that at least one protest shall be given to this method of legislating, which contravenes the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of our country. Furthermore, the evil of such a procedure is apparent when a revenue bill, drafted by those not connected with the legislative department, is sent to the legislative branch of the Government with the injunction to take it as a whole or reject it as a whole, denying us even the meager privilege of offering amendments to a proposition solely legislative. Thus we see the legislative branch of our Government, which should be kept separate from the Executive, is only executing the behests of the Executive, losing its identity altogether, and appearing in the rôle of simply confirming a secret agreement entered into by the Executive with a foreign nation.

As a result of this mode of procedure, this legislation is ostensibly considered by the committee having jurisdiction over it without scarcely any relevant information. You may search in vain through the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee to find that anyone has appeared to advocate this agreement. Some men will be found to have appeared before the committee to urge some specific thing in which they appear to have specific interest, but the proposition as a whole fails to find any advocate. The preparation which is requisite, the discussion which is essential, the presentation of facts which are necessary to a proper understanding of the subject, are all wanting. The author of the bill, as declared by him, which declaration may be found in the hearings, did not draw up the bill. Data which has been gathered at a great expense by the Tariff Board asked for at the very beginning of the hearing could not be secured in order that a proper estimate of the agreement might be made. On the whole, everything that tended to conceal the exact purport of the proposition failed to materialize, and the bill was hastily brought into the House. In the House we find the action of the proponents of the measure as zealous to press the matter to a conclusion, to the end, I must assume, that little or no light may be thrown upon the subject which might enlighten the people as to the object desired to be accomplished by the measure. Hasty legislation of any character can not but lend itself to improper legislation. There should have been a thorough investigation of the subject and more light thrown upon its various intricate provisions. In fact, the amendment in regard to wood pulp, pulp wood, and print paper shows with what haste the bill was drawn and how immature it was and still is, since it is contended by those who claim to be thoroughly familiar with the subject and who appeared before the committee that had the bill not been amended in this respect the provision, as originally placed in the bill, would have occasioned the defeat of the entire measure. With the lack of information which could not be obtained in regard to this proposition, it can only be discussed in a general way and without much detail. It is obvious from the mere reading of the bill that everything produced on the farm is placed upon the free list, while everything manufactured is retained upon the dutiable list at the same rate of duty or at slightly reduced rates. That in itself should condemn it in the eyes of every right-thinking man. Surely the farmer and the laborer are entitled

to fair treatment—they ask for nothing more; they should not receive less.

That wheat should be put on the free list and a tax retained on flour; that barley should be put on the free list and a tax retained on barley malt; that cattle, sheep, and hogs should be put on the free list, while meat, pork, and other meat products should be kept on the dutiable list, is a matter not easy to fathom, unless we shall admit that we have become converts to that insidious doctrine of New England of free raw material, by which it hopes to continue the control over manufactured articles, which through protection it has been able to maintain heretofore. That timber should be excluded from our market, lumber in the rough placed on the free list and manufactured lumber retained on the dutiable list, affords another illustration of the vagaries of this measure. In fine, the statement can be made that the purpose of this measure is to put the farmer of this country in direct competition with the Canadian farmer, in so far as the products of his farm are concerned, thus tending to reduce the price of farm products and, consequently, the value of the farm itself; while everything that he consumes, even the machinery which he uses, and everything that enters into the daily needs of himself and his family he is compelled to purchase from a protective market. It seems to me that the farmer should have an equal chance with the manufacturer. It is not he who is building enormous fortunes. It is the manufacturer. It is not he who is forming trusts and combinations in restraint of trade to increase the cost of living. It is the manufacturer who is engaged in such business, but it is the farmer who is furnishing the raw material out of which every need of the country is supplied. That the Meat Trust should receive consideration in order to enable it to maintain the high price of meat, while the farmer furnishes the animal on the hoof out of which the meat is produced free of duty, will not be easily explained to the farming communities in this country. Nor must it be conceived that the farmer along the Canadian border is the only one who will be called upon to suffer because of the adoption of the policy upon which this agreement is based. The farmer in the cotton States will find that the cattle he raises, the sheep and the hogs of his farm, will go into direct competition in the large packing centers of this country with the free cattle, hogs, and sheep from Canada.

This of necessity will decrease the price of the animal on the hoof and depress the price of his feedstuff—the corn, the hay, and the oats of the farmer—while the price of meat will steadily continue to soar high and higher, as it has been soaring, to the discomfort and suffering of all classes of our people.

If tariff taxes are a burden on a people, as contended by some, I believe that the burden should be equally distributed among all classes. If any benefits accrue from the imposition of tariff taxes on imported articles, as others contend, that profit should accrue to all those engaged in the various vocations in which our people are engaged. To take off the tax on one class of products necessarily involves the increasing of taxes on all the others from which revenues must be raised to administer the Government.

One can readily see that a tax on wool and a tax on woolen goods, if placed at legitimate figures, can be maintained with justice to the producer of wool and the manufacturer of woolen goods. But if the tax on the wool is taken off, the value of the wool depreciates, while that which is taken off of the tax on wool must be added to the tax on woolen goods, which increases the price to the consumer of woolen goods. In other words, the larger the free list the higher and more onerous must be the taxable list. The more evenly distributed the tax the lighter the burden on the consumer of the goods taxed and the more equitably the burden of the Government is placed upon all alike.

In the majority report there appears this remarkable statement:

The most striking tendency shown by our census of 1910 is the remarkable increase in the population of our great cities compared with the slow growth and, in some cases, the decline in our most fertile agricultural regions. The number of people who consume the fruits of the soil, compared with those who produce them, is rapidly growing greater.

This statement is remarkable not in that it is not true, but it is remarkable because it is found in this report and urged in support of the pending bill. That the people of the farming sections are gradually moving into the cities and towns and seeking other vocations than that of farming, which is not sufficiently profitable, is known by everyone. Our newspapers and magazines have teemed with articles on that subject. It has been the subject of ceaseless discussion by our trained minds in economic matters. And yet it is urged in support of this measure, which proposes to place on the free list everything which the farmer produces and maintain the high standard of prices on everything he consumes. This agreement will have a

tendency not only to encourage the farmer to leave his farm, but to cause those who have migrated to the cities and towns to remain there. If this statement does not suggest that idea I fail to understand its import. But it has been argued, and on this point the argument of the proponents of this measure has been on both sides of the question: First, that removing the duty on farm products will not decrease the price of farm products; second, that removing the duty on farm products will cheapen the cost of living. In other words, it is contended at one and the same time that the farmer will get every bit as much for his farm products after this agreement is entered into as he now receives, but that the manufacturer, who is the consumer of the farmer's products, will pay less for that which the farmer sells at the same price, and therefore be enabled to sell his manufactured articles to the ultimate consumer—the same farmer and the men who toil at salaries, at a less price.

I presume that it is because of the first proposition that this agreement will not reduce the price of farm products that the majority of the committee have found it necessary to use the language in the quotation which I have just read. It will be difficult, indeed, to make the intelligent farmer or the ultimate consumer understand this process of reasoning, though it is unquestionably well understood by the manufacturer, whether it be the packing house, the miller, or the agricultural implement manufacturer, for he can readily see that he is securing a larger market of raw material to draw from at a reduced price, and that there is no obligation on his part to correspondingly reduce the price of the output of his factory since his tariff is maintained.

It has been argued by men who are devotees of the free-trade idea that the tariff now imposed upon agricultural products does not affect the price of those products. If that be so, then the removing of the duty means absolutely nothing. And yet the only articles which it is proposed by this agreement to make free are those very same farm products. Therefore, if this legislation will not affect the price of farm products, one way or the other, I fail to see any quid pro quo for entering into the agreement. This ceases to be a reciprocal, as it at once becomes an unilateral agreement, exclusively in the interest of Canada and the American manufacturer. For, if we receive no advantage in the cost of raw material by taking off the duty on raw material, we shall receive no benefits from the standpoint of the proponents of this measure, and the cost of living will not be affected. To the contrary, as the tax is lost by removing the duty from these articles, it will have to be recouped by imposing a greater duty on manufactured articles, which will necessarily make the cost of living even greater than the high prices that are now being paid by the American people.

There is possibly only one article in this reciprocal agreement that directly affects most of the States of the South. Rough lumber and square and hewn timber, telegraph poles, cross-ties, and so forth, are placed upon the free list. Washington and the timber States of the Northwest will, of course, bear the brunt of the competition that will result, but the States of the South which produce lumber, and Louisiana is second only to Washington in lumber production, will be affected to a marked extent. It is estimated that Canadian lumber will control the market as far south as Pittsburg and Kansas City, and that on account of freight rates, which are said to be \$1.75 as against \$8 and \$10 on lumber from Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Mississippi, southern lumber will be entirely driven from this large consuming territory. This industry is now in a languishing condition, and to be at once driven out of such an important territory will have an effect which is now not so easy to calculate, but which can easily account for the disturbed condition of that industry throughout the South, and the uneasiness of our people in that section.

If for no other reason, this one would suffice to compel me to oppose this proposed legislation. But there are many other reasons equally if not more potent. For instance, this agreement is called a reciprocal trade agreement, and by that term one would be led to believe that there are equal advantages to both parties to the agreement.

Looking into the articles affected and the quantity imported and exported in the commerce between Canada and the United States, we find this very striking discrimination against the United States and in favor of Canada: Last year there was imported into Canada from the United States of the articles included in this bill \$47,827,959. There was imported into the United States from Canada \$47,333,158 of the same articles—practically an even trade as to the articles affected by the proposed bill. The Canadian Government collected on the forty-seven and three-quarter millions that were imported into Canada from the United States \$7,776,236.19, and under the present law the calculated remittance of the tax on our goods by Canada

will amount to \$2,560,579.04. So Canada will still collect, assuming that under this act the same amount of articles were imported into Canada from the United States, \$5,215,637.15. On the forty-seven and a quarter millions which the United States imports from Canada the duty collected was \$5,649,826. It is now proposed that this bill will secure the remittal by the United States of \$4,849,933. Assuming, therefore, that an equal amount of the articles are imported into the United States from Canada, under this bill the duty of four and three-quarter millions of dollars will be reduced to \$799,893. In other words, in the duty now collected on the same valuation of articles affected by this bill into Canada from the United States there will be a reduction of two and a half million dollars, leaving a payment of five and a quarter millions of dollars to the Canadian Government, as against a reduction of four and three-quarter millions in taxes, amounting to five and a half millions, leaving a little more than three-quarters of a million dollars to be collected by us. Canada, on the same basis of articles, will still collect, after this law goes into effect, as much taxation as the United States Government now collects, and the United States Government will lose in revenues four-fifths of its present collections. This sum, deducted from the revenue of the Government by operation of this law, will necessitate its being made up in other directions. Therefore, in securing the free list from Canada we are not only putting the farmer at an obvious disadvantage, but we are at the same time putting the manufacturer in even a better position to exact still higher prices from everything that the American people consume.

But even this does not picture our whole disadvantage in this proposed reciprocal agreement. For it is well known that the Canadian Government gives a preferential rate of duty to Great Britain, its mother country. Our hearings were so incomplete that we have not been able to ascertain just what that preferential duty is. But we are cognizant of the fact that Great Britain enjoys a preferential duty upon the goods which it exports into Canada.

The division which has occurred in Canada over the adoption of this reciprocal agreement has necessitated a public statement, generally reported in the press of this country, by the finance minister of Canada, Mr. Fielding, who was one of the two commissioners representing the Canadian Government in the drafting of this reciprocal agreement. In that statement I find the following:

It appears to be assumed in some quarters that the tariff rates agreed upon discriminate in favor of the United States and against Great Britain. There is no foundation for this.

In every case Great Britain will still have the same rate or a lower one. Canada's right to deal with the British preference as she pleases remains untouched by the agreement. The adoption of the agreement will probably lead to some further revision of the Canadian tariff, in which the Canadian Parliament will be entirely free to fix the British preferential tariff at any rates that may be deemed proper.

Great Britain is a manufacturing country, and under this reciprocal agreement we are seeking a market for our manufacturers. It is not supposed that we will export in any great quantities agricultural products under the free-trade provisions of this act. But it is for the manufacturer that we expect to secure in Canada increased markets for his products. Now, what becomes of the preferential which we secure under the provisions of this act if the Canadian Parliament is at liberty to make further preferential tariffs in favor of Great Britain? Where does the exchange come in? Under the policy of the administration, which is advocating this agreement, we now impose high duties on manufactured goods from Great Britain entering this country. And those duties are imposed with a view of excluding what are termed the "cheaper productions" of England from competing with our high-class products in the markets of the United States.

But here we are securing a supposed advantage by negotiating an agreement somewhat reducing the duties on manufactured goods exported from this country into Canada in order to secure the Canadian market, and we are warned in advance by one of the commissioners who is thoroughly familiar with every detail of this agreement—certainly more familiar with it than anyone on this floor, since he assisted in its drafting, that Great Britain shall not suffer because of this reciprocal agreement; that that is intended to flimflam us, and that if, upon investigation, it is found that the preferential tariffs of Great Britain are not sufficiently large to give Great Britain the control of the Canadian market, it will be up to the Parliament of Canada to further reduce the preferential duties in favor of Great Britain, in order that she might continue to hold the market to our exclusion. I for one can see nothing reciprocal about this agreement, and I wish to warn my colleagues repre-

senting agricultural communities that this proposition is but the beginning of a series of similarly vicious legislation that will further impoverish the farming element of this country without decreasing or, I may more properly say, at the same time increasing the cost of everything consumed by this class of our people.

I find that my colleague, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, whom we have already elected Speaker of the next House of Representatives, is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

If the evening papers are to be believed, the President is going to call an extra session unless he gets his reciprocity scheme through this Congress. He has adopted one more Democratic principle. Give him time enough and he will adopt them all. While he is urging a reciprocity treaty with Canada—and I am heartily in favor of that—I wish he would extend its operations so as to take in our sister Republics on the south, every one of them in the Western Hemisphere. We ought to have the lion's share of all the trade with all the countries in the world. What we need most is a wider market for American products, and that is what Democrats will try to secure. In this laudable undertaking we invoke the aid of all American citizens.

Through the press I notice that the President of the United States entertains very much the same views that our colleague expressed on the floor of the House. In fact it was only yesterday that the President and Mr. CLARK met on the same platform at the Pan-American Commercial Conference, which is being held in this city. In the Washington Post, Mr. CLARK is quoted as saying, "I am in favor of reciprocity, not only with Canada, but with all the South and Central American Republics. In fact I am in favor of reciprocity with all the nations of the earth."

This same paper gives from Mr. Taft's speech at the conference the following quotation:

Mr. CLARK is in favor of reciprocity agreements with all parts of the world, and so am I. That does not help to a definite agreement in the case of any one nation. But Mr. CLARK and I have at least got together on one very important matter, and I hope we can carry it through.

Thus it is seen that in the future efforts will be made to patch up our tariff, not by revising it, but by negotiating treaties which will be enacted entirely at the expense of the farming element of the country and which will greatly augment the profits of the manufacturers, while additional tariffs will be imposed upon the importation of manufactured goods, to the detriment of the consumers of this country.

The doctrine, as declared by Mr. CLARK, that he favors reciprocity with all the nations of the world is a complete abandonment of the right of this House under the Constitution to originate bills affecting the revenue, and to transfer that right to the Executive. The abdication of the constitutional prerogative is complete, and hereafter, under that policy, the mission of the House will simply be to answer yea or nay to all revenue legislation affecting the fisc of the country. The House is compensated, apparently, for the loss of this important prerogative by itself, in turn, usurping concurrent jurisdiction with the Senate in matters affecting treaty negotiations between this and foreign countries.

I am frank to confess that had this declaration come from the gentleman, whom we Democrats have already elevated to the Speakership of the next House, prior to his significantly early election, I should have, despite my admiration for his talents and my personal liking for him as a man, voted against him. Of course, that would not have prevented his election; but it would have at least emphasized my protest against the policy which I find him advocating. To Louisiana's greatest industries—sugar and rice—this policy spells absolute destruction. It will give us free sugar from tropical cane, against which we can not compete.

In 1909 there was failure of the corn crop of Mexico. The Government of Mexico was purchasing corn from this country and Argentina in order to supply corn to its poor people at the lowest possible cost. That year in Louisiana and Texas we had a surplus of low-grade rice. The rice people of those two States asked me to go to Mexico with one of their representatives and try to place some of this rice. As to Mexico's production, we were unable to ascertain any information; but we were aware of the fact that the Mexican is a rice consumer. I went to Mexico with the manager of the Rice Association of America, Mr. Henri L. Gueydan, and a careful investigation showed that, while rice production in Mexico was in its infancy, yet Mexico was exporting rice to this country, and could and did dispose of it at a cheaper rate than we could afford to sell it.

A treaty, similar to this one, is said to be under consideration between representatives of our Government and Mexico. Who can predict the future of our rice industry should that treaty be entered into?

The President yesterday, with great candidness, as quoted by the press, gives these reasons for the faith that is in him:

We are changing from a country that raises agricultural products and exports them to the world to a country that in the near future, unless our production of agriculture increases, will become a food-consuming country, and will depend upon our manufacturers for our export trade. When we reach that point, I hope that the American ingenuity and the American desire to succeed in trade will fit our products so that they will attract those to whom we wish to sell more than the products of the other nations will attract those same people.

Frankly stated, we shall put the farmer out of business and fondle the manufacturer. The farmer is languishing; we shall complete his undoing.

Surely, this specie of reciprocity, and, in fact, every species of reciprocity, is repugnant to Democratic ideas, as is every species of the free-trade list. I take it that there is no room under the doctrine of a tariff for revenue, as advocated by the Democratic Party, for either the free list or the reciprocal agreement. Even this measure, receiving as it is about to receive, the support of the majority of the Democrats on this floor, under caucus instructions, is admittedly undemocratic; and let me quote, in this connection, the resolution adopted by the caucus:

Whereas the Canadian reciprocity agreement negotiated by the Reciprocity Commission of the Dominion of Canada and the President of the United States, while not formulated in accordance with Democratic platform demands, is a reduction of some of the prohibitive schedules in the Payne tariff law, will tend to expand the trade of the United States in the Dominion of Canada, and is in part a recognition of the principles the Democratic Party has contended for in the Congress and in its platforms.

And from the Democratic platform of 1892 I quote the following:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith; but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive taxes against the richest countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessities and comforts of life among our own people.

From the Democratic campaign book of that same year I am going to read to you excerpts which confirm the plank of the Democratic platform that I have just quoted:

That the system of reciprocity to which the Republicans are now pointing with pride was begotten two years ago in fraud, was conceived in dissimulation, was born in falsehood, and is now wrapped in the juggled figures of systematic misrepresentation.

In the Democratic campaign textbook of 1902 there appears the following:

Reciprocity looks like free trade but tastes like protection. It is really a new sugar coating prepared by the Republican tariff doctors for many patients who are refusing to take their protection pills straight.

Again:

Reciprocity is based upon the same false theories as is protection, and, like protection, is a sham and a humbug, and to most people has been and will ever continue to be a delusion and a snare.

Again:

Reciprocity with one country means a tariff war with other countries; makes a few friends and many enemies.

Again:

Reciprocity legislation confers dangerous and perhaps unconstitutional powers upon the President.

Now, on the same subject, listen to what the Republican platform of 1892 has to say:

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased, and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

And in its platform of 1896 I find this declaration:

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity agreement negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure enlarged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessities of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interest which again open markets for us in return for our open markets to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade and secures our own market for ourselves. Reciprocity builds up foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.

These quotations will indicate that the wording of the caucus resolution, in so far as it calls this measure as "not formulated in accordance with Democratic platform demands," is in thorough conformity with the history of our party upon this question. To the mind of everyone it should convey the conclusion that the Democratic Party has never favored reciprocity. The same program that appears to exist in the minds of the next Speaker of the House and of the President of the United States agitated the public mind at the time of the adoption of what was known as the McKinley bill—the tariff act of 1890.

As it passed the House the bill carried no provision relating to reciprocity. Mr. Blaine was then Secretary of State and had urged a provision in the act by which the President would be permitted to enter into reciprocal agreements with the countries to the south of us. In the Senate Senator ALDRICH introduced an amendment to carry out the wishes of Mr. Blaine and to permit the negotiation of these treaties.

That treaty had special reference to all the countries referred to in the remarks of Mr. CLARK, as well as in the remarks of the President. It will probably be interesting to note that every vote cast against the proposition was a Democratic vote, except those of Senator Edmunds and Senator Evarts. The list of the Democrats who voted against this measure includes the names of some of the greatest leaders of our party, most of whom have departed this life, but who have left behind them works for which the country justly feels proud. They were: Senators Barbour, Bate, Berry, Butler, Carlisle, Cockrell, Coke, Colquitt, Daniel, Eustis, Faulkner, Gibson, Gorman, Gray, Harris, Jones of Arkansas, Kenna, Morgan, Pasco, Pugh, Ransom, Reagan, Vance, Vest, Walthall, and Wilson of Maryland.

The names of those Democrats should forever be perpetuated, for they stood by the platform of our party and opposed just such a policy as is carried in the pending bill, and which is contemplated by the present administration to be its future policy.

This measure is but the precursor of many more of a similar character, and establishes a precedent that Congress will soon be called upon to repudiate, if our farmers and laborers are to be given an equal opportunity in this country with others of our people engaged in other avocations. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, the measure under consideration, "To promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," is the beginning of a sensible, patriotic policy that this country should have adopted before this.

In my judgment, it is a step in the right direction, and if enacted into law must inure to the benefit of the great army of consumers, who have had but little or no advantage from the tariffs of the last 50 years.

True, they have been the means of building up and fostering the great trusts, combinations, and monopolies of the country.

If I had the time, it would be interesting to give the history of such well-known men as Carnegie, Frick, Schwab, Corey, Duke, and others whose names stand for immense fortunes, made in the last 30 years. These gigantic aggregations of wealth are the direct result of the tariff. The prevailing opinion among the farmers is that protection benefits them. Never was a greater confidence game played upon this important and influential class of our American citizens. Thanks to the reading and intelligence of our farmers, they are not longer misled by the specious pleadings of the highly protected manufacturers. Their eyes are opened, and they are now found against ship subsidy, protective tariff, government by commissions, and, finally, they are now asked to oppose the Canadian reciprocity, recommended and urged by the President.

As stated yesterday on the floor of the House, that at a meeting of a number of Patrons of Husbandry, known as Grangers, on Saturday last I was astonished to find a strong sentiment in favor of reciprocity with Canada. The objections raised were the duty on flour and dressed meats. The flour and meat trusts were blamed. When fully discussed the facts brought out that the many thousands of men employed in these industries would suffer seriously if these items were put on the free list. The same applied to dressed lumber. The more men employed in our mills and factories the greater the demand for farm products. When it comes to wheat, rye, oats, barley, and so forth, the market price of these cereals is fixed at Liverpool, based on the laws of supply and demand. This is so universally conceded that it is a waste of time to argue further on this line. As to corn, Canada is in no sense a competitor. The climate makes it unprofitable to raise this great staple.

In 1910 Canada sent us \$97,000,000 of her products, while the United States exported into that country \$223,000,000, a trade balance in our favor of \$126,000,000. Under the beneficent provisions of this measure it will be more than doubled the first year. Freer trade with Canada is what the people of this country demand.

As a farmer's son, and a farmer now, proud of the honored occupation and of the 30,000,000 of people engaged in it, I wish to announce with emphasis that if I thought this measure would injure the farmers of the country my opposition would be as pronounced as my advocacy on this floor and elsewhere.

The enemies of this wise and patriotic measure are all high-tariff advocates. They are the men who were responsible for the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill that the country repudiated. The people demanded a reduction of the tariff schedules, especially on the necessities of life. The report of the Ways and Means Committee, which accompanies this bill, is a very instructive document, so much so that I desire to add the following excerpts:

But it should not be inferred from the foregoing that we shall not derive any immediate advantage from a removal of the duty on wheat. Our tariff dike has the effect of preventing millions of bushels of Canadian wheat from coming across the border, as it were, by the force of gravity, and of turning this traffic through artificial channels to the Atlantic seaboard. If this tariff dike were broken down, it is inevitable that very much of it would come into our country. And would it decrease the price of our wheat? By no means, for that would be fixed by the world's price. For every bushel that would come in at Manitoba, so long as we raise a surplus, another bushel would go out at New York. The center of the wheat-growing area of North America on the north and south line is in the vicinity of Minneapolis. It is also the central point for the making of flour. The natural destination of great quantities of wheat of the Canadian Northwest is Minneapolis. The difference in the quality of the Canadian and American wheat is such that by blending the two grains a better flour is produced than could be made from either alone. And if we did not restrict its importation a tremendous impetus would be given to the flour-making industry and to the trades dependent upon it. The clearing of the transactions would create a business of an important financial character, much of the purchase price would be likely to find its way into the general channels of trade, and our American railways would have a profitable business which would aid in their maintenance and result in the remunerative employment of labor.

The bill provides for free lumber, which will tend to conserve our forests and reduce the price of an article of prime necessity. Briefly stated, the economic advantages to us of the reciprocal duties and free lists proposed by the bill are likely to be: First, that they will act as regulators of the prices of very many necessary articles generally consumed by our people, and in times of scarcity in particular articles will tend to keep prices down; and, second, by augmenting the prosperity of the country, which, according to her population, is by far the best foreign customer we have, they will increase her purchasing power, and thus increase our own trade. The bill is a measure in the interests of the great mass of the people of the country, and the committee recommend its passage.

I shall conclude my remarks with an editorial from the New York Herald of this date, which speaks for itself:

VICTORY FOR RECIPROCITY IN THE HOUSE.

Sentiment in favor of the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada is sweeping the country like a prairie fire.

The House of Representatives yesterday on a test vote showed a majority of 77 in favor of the McCall bill embodying the provisions of the agreement, and our special Washington dispatches indicate that the bill will be passed this evening.

At the opening yesterday of the Pan-American Commercial Congress, attended by delegates from all parts of Central and South America, there was enthusiastic advocacy of reciprocity. Speeches favoring it were made by the Democratic leader, Representative CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, and by President Taft, who frankly declared they had found a plank upon which both could stand.

As shown in this incident, as well as in the test vote in the House, party lines are ignored in dealing with the matter of trade reciprocity, and this is as it should be, for the question involved is purely economic—not political. Representative GAINES, of West Virginia, speaking in opposition to the McCall bill, yesterday, declared that it was unfavorable to the United States. Asked to explain why, if this were so, there was so much opposition to it in the British and Canadian Parliaments, he admitted that he could not explain very clearly. A Democratic Representative, however, called out:

"I can tell you where it comes from. It comes from special interests who will be hurt in those countries, just as it does in this country."

That, in a nutshell, is the secret of the opposition. Dispatches from the Herald's bureau at Ottawa this morning show that the Canadian opponents of the agreement are raising the old scarecrow of "annexation"—good evidence that they have failed to find any reasonable arguments in opposition to the agreement. The intelligent people of Canada who are not profiting by "protection" are, however, as earnest as the people of the United States for adoption of the agreement, and its ultimate victory seems assured.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the proper tests to apply to this proposed reciprocal trade agreement must be, Is it mutually advantageous to both countries, is it reasonably just and fair alike to all classes of our people, and is it sound in economics?

The proposition which is before us divides the articles on which the duty is to be removed or reduced into four classes, under as many schedules. They are (1) articles which are placed on the reciprocal free list, (2) articles on which there

is to be a mutual reduction of duty, (3) articles to be admitted into the United States from Canada at special rates of duty, and (4) articles to be admitted into Canada from the United States at special rates of duty.

Four general classes of products are affected:

First. Leading food and agricultural products, rough lumber, some raw materials, and printing paper.

Second. Secondary food products, such as fresh and canned meats, flours, and partly manufactured food preparations, upon which rates are reduced and made identical.

Third. Manufactured commodities, such as motor vehicles, cutlery, sanitary fixtures, and miscellaneous articles, on which rates are mutually reduced.

Fourth. A small list of articles on which special rates are given by each country. Canada reduces the duty on coal and cement and the United States reduces the duty on iron ore and aluminum products.

The most important provision of the arrangement is that embodied in Schedule A, which provides substantially for free trade between Canada and the United States in agricultural products. This includes cattle, horses, hogs, sheep, and all other live animals, wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, and all fresh vegetables, dairy products, eggs, poultry, and so forth.

There is no substantial difference of opinion that the free interchange of agricultural products between the two countries will be almost wholly to the advantage of Canada, with her vast areas of low-priced lands, gaining free access to a market of 90,000,000 of people. If the agreement provided nothing more than this it would be a jug-handled arrangement, with the advantage practically all on the side of the Canadian. It is of little or no advantage to us to secure free access to the Canadian market for our agricultural products, which, in the main, Canada does not want and will not buy.

If the United States is to derive any mutual advantage from reciprocity with Canada it must come from an enlarged market for our manufactured articles in exchange for Canada's natural products. This is the whole foundation upon which the arguments for Canadian reciprocity have been reared. Such an arrangement might be somewhat injurious to our farmers, but, it has been argued, this loss would be offset by the enlargement of our manufactures and the consequent increase of the home market for farm products.

How much of advantage to the American manufacturer is to be found in Schedule B, which fixes identical rates of duty on a limited list of manufactured articles between the two countries? Will the reductions made in the Canadian tariff enable our manufacturers to increase their sales in Canada at all?

The reduction in Canadian general rates ranges from 2½ to 5 per cent ad valorem. A reduction of 2½ per cent ad valorem is yielded by Canada on farm wagons, harvesters, reapers, mowers, and cutlery, and a 5 per cent reduction on plows, harrows, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and the like. On portable engines, horse powers, manure spreaders, and windmills the Canadian rates remain the same, although we reduce our rates on these articles from 10 to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Will anyone contend that these slight reductions by Canada will open a market for any of these products? Take farm wagons, as an illustration. The reduction of the Canadian duty is 2½ per cent ad valorem. In other words, on a wagon worth \$40 the reduction of the Canadian tariff under this arrangement would be just \$1 per wagon. Would that slight reduction enable us to sell a single wagon more in Canada than we do now?

A most interesting side light is thrown on this phase of the question by the Hon. W. S. Fielding, the Canadian Minister of Finance, who was one of the negotiators of this arrangement. It is well understood that England enjoys a preferential tariff with Canada, and there was some unrest in the mother country lest this arrangement might give the American manufacturer access to the Canadian markets at the expense of their British competitors. The British manufacturer was assured by Mr. Fielding on this point by this cheering message:

The range of manufactures affected is comparatively small, and in most cases the reductions are small.

If this were not enough to assure the British manufacturer that he is to lose none of the market he now enjoys in Canada, he must be perfectly contented with the further assurance that if it should work out differently, the Canadian preferential tariff can be adjusted to restore the British advantage.

When these facts are considered in connection with the facts shown yesterday by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES] that Great Britain's preferential tariff with Canada is still from 25 to 50 per cent lower than the rates we would enjoy under this treaty, will some one kindly tell us how the

market for American manufactures is to be broadened at all under the terms of this agreement?

Where, then, is the quid pro quo for the United States in subjecting agriculture in the United States, with its high-priced land, to the direct competition of the cheap lands of Canada? Is it right that the agricultural industry should bear the entire burden of any reciprocal arrangement which might be beneficial to the Nation as a whole? Even if that were so, who can say that it is fair to pile the load all upon one industry when the compensating benefits to the country generally are not apparent?

What sort of reciprocity is this which subjects the greatest single industry in the United States—agriculture—to absolute free trade with the country whose farms lie nearer the great centers of population in the United States than our own, whose soil is of equal productivity, and who enjoys advantages of water transportation over the American farmer? I do not recognize any of the principles of the reciprocity of James G. Blaine, who pleaded for reciprocity in noncompetitive products. Wherein does this proposal for free trade in farm products conform to the declaration of President McKinley in his last speech on September 5, 1901, when he said that "we should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor." Does this proposed pact with Canada square with the principle declared in the Republican platform of 1900 in opening "our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets?" Or does it fit our platform declaration of 1904, which favored reciprocal arrangements wherever they "can be effected consistent with the principles of protection, and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry?" I confess my bewilderment as to the principles which underlie this proposal, which discriminates so heavily against agriculture, without even an apparent compensatory advantage to the manufactures of the United States.

Another feature of this arrangement which is entitled to some consideration is its increase in the differentials between natural products and the manufactures thereof. Is it entirely fair to place wheat on the free list and maintain a duty on Canadian flour? Why this differential in favor of the millers? Is it consistent to levy a duty of 1½ cents per pound on fresh and cured meats—bacon, hams, shoulders, beef, and pork—and admit cattle and hogs free of duty? Is not this differential all in favor of the packers?

I have a letter here from one of my farmer constituents on this phase of the proposed arrangement, which I desire to insert in the RECORD. It is as follows:

WILTON JUNCTION, IOWA, February 10, 1911.

Hon. A. F. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a farmer and believing, as I do, that as long as protection is the policy of this Government, agricultural products should be equally protected with manufactured articles, I do not believe the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada gives the farmer a square deal, as it places wheat on the free list, while it keeps flour on the tax list. Cattle, hogs, and sheep are free, while meat and products are dutiable, and while it retains the duty on finished lumber and manufactured products, it places logs and rough lumber on the free list, thus cheapening the articles the farmer produces in competition with the Canadian, but not lowering the price on the manufactured goods in a corresponding ratio.

If we are going to have free trade on farm products, let us have the same on the products of the mills, and I most earnestly protest against the proposed treaty and request you use all the influence you can in behalf of the farmer.

Yours, respectfully,

J. R. MCCLEAN.

But the supreme test which should be applied to this proposition is the economic test. Is it sound in economics? I believe that protection is the settled policy of this Nation, notwithstanding recent political reverses which may point temporarily in another direction. It has been the settled policy of the Government for the past 50 years, and I see no indications that the principle is to be abandoned, though there may be differences as to the application of that principle.

During those 50 years this principle has been a tremendous factor in the upbuilding of our country, carrying us forward by leaps and bounds, until to-day we stand forth as the greatest manufacturing nation in the world. Under the operation of this principle the manufacturer and the workman have been protected against the cheap labor of the world by rates of duty sufficient to cover the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. These two great classes of our producers are not required to sell their labor and their products in competition with all the world, at the prevailing world price, if you please.

The agricultural class of producers, however, were not in the same situation. There was a large surplus of farm products which must find a market abroad—a surplus large enough, in many cases, to practically fix the price of the whole. The agricultural classes derived the incidental benefits of a large

home market, but as long as his exportable surplus was so large it virtually fixed the price of his products at the world price. Under the operation of this policy we have seen an exodus from the farm to other more favored industries.

The population of the cities increased, that of the farms dwindled. The result was a lessening of agricultural production in proportion to population. To such an extent has this change gone on that the "back to the farm" question looms large in public attention.

Under the operation of these great natural forces we are just reaching the point where a number of our agricultural products do not show an exportable surplus large enough to fix the price of the whole. This is true of beef and mutton, dairy products, eggs, and perhaps barley. The farmer has almost reached the point where he attains a partial equality with the other producing classes in the United States.

Then there arises a cry for cheaper food products. The great cities and centers of population demand a return to the old conditions under which they can buy their food at the world price and still sell their products at the world price plus a tariff premium. Is that right either in law or morals? Is it just or fair that the great agricultural class shall be discriminated against in this fashion?

A broad consideration of the effects of this proposed arrangement makes clear the effect it will have on agriculture. It is so clearly pointed out by one of the prominent economic writers that I desire to quote:

The abolition of the tariff on foodstuffs between this country and Canada will add enough to the exportable surplus of them in the two countries combined to keep the price of them down to the world price for many years, perhaps for another generation. The American farmer, who had begun to have visions of exchanging commodities on a basis of price equality with other kinds of producers, will find himself again in the same old position, working harder and remaining poorer than his fellow citizens in other industries. He will continue to escape from his relatively uncomfortable lot by abandoning his farm, whenever he can, and passing over into the better kinds of labor. At last he will again overbalance by this method the economic disparity between his class and others. Then the cost of living will jump again; and it will be necessary to find another agricultural country, say Russia, with which to make a reciprocity treaty. But, meanwhile, is there any social justice or any economic sense in the proceeding? And if there is not, ought any true lover of the best interests of the country to desire the ratification of the proposed treaty?

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the desirability of increasing the solidarity of the nations of North America and of cementing the friendships between neighboring peoples, but if that can only be accomplished by an unjust discrimination against the American farmer—against that great class of our citizens who actually create the wealth which is the foundation of all our prosperity—then I say the price is too great. The sense of fair play in the mind of every American citizen will not sanction the attainment of any end, however desirable, through methods that are discriminatory and unjust.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, we can not in this proposed agreement settle the tariff problem. It is the trade relations alone between the United States and Canada that we are to consider. If all the tariff laws between the two countries were to be repealed and all commodities produced in either, admitted free to the other, it would be a very different question than that which confronts us. It would then be as if the two countries were one and there would be no revenue collectors along the line. In that case I would be enthusiastically for it. Then all the sweeping statements that 3,000 miles of division line would disappear, and the like, would be a little more appealing.

We may as well talk heart to heart and reason to reason, unprejudiced, about this agreement. We shall be called on to cast our votes and should honestly vote as we think the common interests require. We should not be provincial in our aim. We should take a broad national view. We should, however, see that no important industrial necessity of our country is put out of relation with the other industries.

It is admitted that farm production ranks the highest in its importance, and as the proposed agreement makes the farmers of the United States and Canada compete with each other on a free-trade basis, but protects the factories of each country against competition with the other, it puts one industry on a free-trade basis and the others on a protective-tariff basis. It is rather strange that that should be attempted, and on that account it is a matter of interest to inquire how this agreement was brought about.

I want to know why wheat that the farmer grows and sells to the speculator and miller is to be free, and flour that the manufacturer makes and from whom the farmer, wage earner, and others buy is to be protected by a tariff of 50 cents per barrel, which is more than the labor cost of producing it. If wheat is to be free, why not flour? Why force the farmer and other consumers to give the miller 50 cents a barrel extra? I want to know why hogs, sheep, and other live animals that

farmers raise and sell to the speculators and packing companies are not to be protected with a tariff when the packers are to be protected by a tariff of 1½ cents per pound on the lard, mutton, fresh meats, bacon, hams, shoulders and sides, beef salted in barrels, pork barreled in brine, dried or smoked meats, and so forth. These the farmers often buy and wage-earners always buy.

I want to know why a farmer's chickens, ducks, turkeys, and geese are not to be protected when the farmers sell to the speculators and packers, but a 20 per cent tariff is to be added when the farmer, the wage earner, and others buy canned meats and poultry from the packers. I want to know why eggs are not to be protected when the farmers sell them, but the yolks of eggs are to be when the packers sell. I want to know why vegetables that farmers raise and sell are not to be protected when the packers are protected on these when canned. Why is it proposed to make potatoes and onions free, when there is to be a tariff on the machinery and tools with which farmers do their work? These are sold by the trusts to the farmers. And so I might go on and inquire why other things that the farmers produce are not to be protected when the things that farmers and other plain people buy which are trust produced are to be tariff protected.

The tariff of 25 cents per bushel on wheat when imported into the United States and 12 cents if exported to Canada at times affects the price in these countries, but as long as we export wheat the difference probably never exceeds 11 cents per bushel. So, while under some conditions the tariff increases the price of wheat, and to remove it would reduce the cost of flour if we did not give the miller 50 cents tariff per barrel, but it is proposed by this agreement to do that, which amounts to the equivalent of over 11 cents tariff per bushel on the wheat required to make it. So, on the one hand, it is proposed to discourage the farmer from raising wheat, and, on the other, it is proposed to protect the miller, in order to enable him to charge the consumer the tariff.

Following the same idea on other farm products, and then comparing that with the tariff on the manufactured products, we shall see the absurdity of the proposed agreement. Corn to be free, but corn meal to have a tariff of 12½ cents per hundred pounds; rye to be free, but rye flour to have a tariff of 50 cents per barrel; oats free, but oatmeal to have a tariff of 50 cents per hundred pounds; barley free, but barley malt a tariff of 45 cents per hundred pounds; buckwheat free, but buckwheat flour 50 cents tariff per hundred pounds; peas free, but split peas 7½ cents tariff per bushel; all grains free, but prepared cereal foods 17½ per cent tariff, and mill feed and middlings 12½ cents per hundred pounds; cattle free, but the meats which are prepared by the packers to be protected by a tariff of 1½ cents per pound. The eggs, vegetables, and other products of the farmers are to have no tariff, but when these are canned the packers are to be protected by a tariff.

Is it expected that the people are going to eat the grain without its being ground, the cattle without their being slaughtered, and so on, in order to give them cheaper food?

What sort of agreement is this that proposes to make the manufacturer appear sacred, so that by law he is to separate the original producer and the final consumer by the levy of his toll on each?

Here we are, in what is supposed to be one of the most important legislative bodies on earth, suddenly confronted with an important bill and asked to pass it almost clandestinely and before the American public can read it.

The people have heard about it, and they are desperate to get relief from much of the foolish legislation that this body has previously enacted and that is now a burden on them.

And reciprocity sounds good. Do we think the conditions now would be different if Canada and the United States had been one country? We should not fool ourselves by any such supposition. We would simply have a few more States with the same conditions. That is not where our trouble lies.

Reciprocity is not a specific but a general term that may be applied equally to high or low tariff or to no tariff at all. But somehow many people have the idea that it is the latter. They should study the agreement. What is the use of fooling ourselves in order to believe that the social problems will be solved by reciprocity of the kind proposed in this bill?

If all the countries in the world were to apply for and be admitted as States of the same character and their peoples were as nearly like us as the Canadians are we would still be face to face with the same problems that confront us now. Of course, any change makes a temporary difference. It is our social conditions that are wrong. We will flounder around perhaps a few years more and suddenly we will wake up to the fact that our basis is in error, and then we shall begin to establish another kind of reciprocity—a reciprocity that does

away with special privileges such as this bill expressly maintains. We will hear more about that when it shall have been discovered that reciprocity will leave us with the same problems still unsolved.

Let us, in passing, observe that as long as Canada was an insignificant producer of farm products our farmers were induced to vote the manufacturers a protective tariff in exchange for protection on farm products, and it has been for a long time a burden on the ever-credulous farmer and other consumers; but now that the years have drifted on and vast areas of the Canadian domain has been opened, resulting in enormous production of grains, stock, and so forth, certain manufacturers and corporations demand reciprocity to enable them to buy the farm products of both countries, with the farmers competing with each other, but when the factories get them they are to be protected by a tariff.

This proposed agreement is reciprocity between holding and manufacturing trusts of the two countries to make reciprocal tariffs in their favor and to reciprocally remove the tariff on the products of the plain producers of both countries so that these may be left to the old law of competition, to compete with each other in the sale of their unprotected products to the holding and manufacturing trusts and, then, when in their control and ready for the final consumers, of whom these same plain producers form the great majority, they again become competitors with each other for its repurchase from the trusts and with a tariff added.

We should bear in mind that there has been much politics lately and many disappointments. The President earnestly desires to secure some measure that shall be satisfactory to the American people, but the President is not able to do all the work pertaining to his great office. It is always necessary for Presidents to parcel out to others the greater part of their work. In the selection of several of his Cabinet officers the President has secured men of whom, some, however honest they may be, have been educated in the schools of the special interests, and who do not understand that the difficulty attaching to this measure is that it is not framed for the common interests. It is pathetic to see how innocent the President is in his discussion of this bill, for it is evident, from his remarks, he has not had time to study it. I quote the following from the President's speech made at Columbus, Ohio, February 10:

The principle of protection takes away the justification for any tariff whatever by way of protection on articles imported from a country where the conditions as to labor and other circumstances are the same as in our own and thus makes the cost of production substantially the same.

Canada is our neighbor on the north for 3,000 miles. Her population is English, Scotch, and French. Her soil is like ours. Her traditions are the same as ours. Her language is ours. Her climate is temperate like ours, except that her growing seasons are shorter and she can not raise corn in any great quantities.

The greatest reason for adopting this agreement is the fact that it is going to unite two countries with kindred people and lying together across a wide continent in a commercial and social union, to the great advantage of both. Such a result does not need to be justified by a nice balancing of pecuniary profit to each.

Good logic, indeed, that of the President, but it does not fit the wording of the agreement. The President is so honest and so innocent in the discussion of the agreement that we can easily believe that, on account of its length, he has taken some one else's word for its contents. Let us note a few things for the purpose of comparing the President's remarks with the agreement: Wheat to have no tariff, but flour to be protected by a tariff of 50 cents per barrel; rye to be free, but rye flour to have 50 cents tariff per barrel; oats free, but oatmeal 50 cents tariff per 100 pounds; barley free, but malt to have 45 cents tariff per 100 pounds, and so on down the list. Note that in each case the farm product is to be free, but the finished manufactured product is to be protected with a tariff, so the manufacturer may charge the farmer and the wage earner with the tariff added.

So, I might continue this list until it aggregated 131 items, mostly the product of the plain producers, that the agreement takes the tariff off, but then, on the other side, there is an aggregate of 131 items in the agreement that are protected by a tariff, and these are almost all products of the trusts, and articles that the plain people must buy from the trusts, and that protective tariff is not consistent with the President's logic.

Now then, in view of these 131 articles proposed to be protected, what shall we do with the President's statement that "the principles of protection takes away the justification for any tariff whatever by way of protection on articles from a country where the conditions as to labor and other circumstances are the same as in our own, and thus makes the cost of production practically the same." And the President says they are practically the same in the United States and Canada. Is it possible that the President would make that statement if he knew the contents of the agreement. The two do not belong together, and therefore I do not believe the President has

studied the agreement, for how is it possible to change the conditions alternately to protect the trusts with a reciprocal tariff that no explanation can account for the necessity, unless it equally applies to the commodities that are reciprocally free. There is no difference in principle in the two, and it can not be explained in any other way than that this bill was drawn for certain manufacturing and railway interests and against the

Now, a few words about the tariff in general.

Will some one tell if, after such an agreement, we are free at any time in the future, without the consent of Canada, to change the 131 items of trust-protected goods so as to place them on the free list, or are we tied legally or morally to maintain the reciprocal contract until we can agree to reciprocally repeal it? I do not believe we are tied, but when the time comes it will be claimed that we are.

Now, a few words about the tariff in general:

If one undertook an argument on the tariff problem based on principles of philosophy, with God as witness and fellow men as jurors, the verdict would be unanimous that the principles of philosophy do not apply to the present tariff system. Then again, if we should undertake to justify the present tariff laws on the basis of common sense applied to common necessity, there would be another misfit. But if we reconcile ourselves to the privilege of a few to be supported by special favors to be taxed against the rest of us, we can go on with the deception until we have defrauded ourselves and our children of all the natural advantages that this country affords.

If we were to apply original truths and fit ourselves to the provisions of nature, we would sweep all tariff laws from our statutes and would collect a direct tax with which to operate our Government and apply a more effective way than a protective tariff to protect American labor. No one with good reason and a knowledge of the facts that are available concerning the real costs of collecting and expending taxes would deny that by the present process of deceiving ourselves it costs us several times more than it would if we did not, instead of a direct tax, prefer to pay our taxes every time we go to a store to buy an article of wearing apparel or a morsel of food. If we were content to be fair with ourselves and apply reason and common sense to the administration of our Government and to our own business, we could change the conditions materially to our advantage, but since we have not learned to be entirely free in our thoughts on these matters we shall have to consider the tariff problem from the viewpoint of the world as men make it.

The proposed agreement with Canada is important enough to justify a reason to reason consideration. I am not representing myself. I am a spokesman for the people; elected for that purpose. I give my time and study to these problems and understand them well enough not to be led by general sweeping statements.

This Canadian agreement is not a matter of sentiment. It is a matter of application of business principles to the ways of men with diversified interests in competitive operation, heretofore and now adjusted to arbitrary barriers. But in that statement we must not neglect the fact that modern trusts enter into our business affairs and have destroyed the old competitive rule in the business of which these trusts have secured control. We are face to face with made conditions that are not natural, but about which our institutions have adjusted. To secure the best results with the least cost we should get back and relate our industries to natural conditions, but we must do so with a full understanding of the consequences of the change. We must consult our own experience.

Anyone who considers first principles knows that we are living on a false basis, but the very fact that we are has created a basis of its own, and in changing we must see that we do not get still farther from economic relations with the natural. If we would enter into these business changes with the enthusiasm, patriotism, and willingness to sacrifice temporarily for the ultimate common good in the same spirit that we would enter an international contest to be settled by force of arms, we should not be long in getting better conditions, and if all humanity labored with that idea in view, the foolish parade of war would disappear. But many people are inspired with greater spirit from the drawn sword than they are from the utterances of statesmen, pointing the way to perpetual peace and greater prosperity. As long as we are willing to sacrifice so much for the one and so little for the other, we shall not be able to solve social problems in the light of true reason.

I receive hundreds of letters and many telegrams and read the newspapers, and can easily observe that in a large number of these the individual interest dominates and the common interest is secondary. But those who have a personal rather than a public interest express themselves the strongest. There are, however, students, business men, farmers, and others interested

from other than selfish motives who write. It is to them that we may look for unprejudiced expression, and to them and the millions of working people who no doubt think about it, but do not have the time to study the agreement nor to write to us, we must respond in our consideration.

To parties addressing me I wrote 50 letters, equally divided to those who had written me to support and those who had requested me to oppose the bill, asking if they had studied the bill. From those opposed I received answers from 14, saying that they had not and did not know its contents, as they had not seen the bill. I received 12 like answers from those favoring, and none wrote that they had seen the bill. I do not wonder that very few people knew the contents of the bill, for I take about 100 newspapers, with the idea of keeping in touch with public sentiment, and I failed to find one in which the bill was discussed in its provisions, and as this agreement was sprung so suddenly I suppose it was difficult for them to obtain copies.

I knew the campaign of 1908 was conducted by the Republican and Democratic Parties with a promise from both to revise the tariff downward, and I knew that by certain combinations made between many of the Republicans and a substantial reinforcement of them by a lesser number of Democrats the promises to revise the tariff downward was defeated. The people were deceived, but a little more time had been given to the consideration of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill than has been given to this, and the people knew they were fooled when it passed. But the protest raised by the people in that case was a lesson to the politicians that they propose not to lose sight of. So when there began to be a general public demand for reciprocity for the free commercial exchange of the products of the United States and Canada between the two peoples there was hurried consultation between some of the special interests, to see if the thing could not be worked to their favor. They did not stop to get all their previous associates politically lined up. It was enough, if they could carry through the plan. No time could be given to the people to study the bill, of course, as that would defeat it. So there was a hurried notice sent out to stampede the country for it, and every sort of advertisement was used. The details of the bill were kept in the background, and this time it was the majority of the Democrats who combined with a smaller number of Republicans to give the people a reciprocity agreement. It is reciprocity, of course, but not what was promised nor what the people wanted. They will discover that in due time. But the funny thing in this, if it were not so serious, is that the Democrats on the other side of the aisle did not see that they could have made this bill just what they claim to want—free trade—for while we might not be able to get Canada to admit our manufactured products free to her markets, they would not hesitate to sign the agreement if we admitted her manufactured products free to our markets, and the Democrats lost their opportunity when they support a gag rule to prevent that. They fail, now that they have the opportunity, to help either the farmer or wage earner, but, on the contrary, damages both, but may be able to redeem themselves later. That is a matter for future proof. I can not see how it is that they let this opportunity pass, for no better opportunity can come to show good work, and the people really want a free interchange of products between this country and Canada. This is the time. While the people have not had a chance to study the bill, we here have, and there is no excuse for us to blunder. The trouble is that the people think this bill is what it is not.

I am not so sure, even though the agreement is ridiculous in some of its provisions and appears to have been drawn to favor the manufacturers, that we should not in the long run benefit by adopting it. I do not by that statement mean that we would get direct benefit from the agreement, for that, at the most, would be but temporary and to only a part of the people, and would carry losses to others, but if we adopt it we shall separate the elements of the old exchange system of tariff tinkering, such as we witnessed in the last tariff legislation. Perhaps the plain producers, in order to make an immediate start, are willing to take the first burden upon themselves of correcting the tariff system.

The commodities of all the tariff-protected trusts specifically taken care of in this agreement might suddenly be put on the free list in our trade with other countries. That is really what will happen, and the trusts that are saved by this agreement will meet their fate in their very selfishness to profit unduly by it. In view of that fact, and that fact only, can any Member justify a vote in favor of the agreement unless it shall be so amended as to carry out the principles expressed in the President's statement previously quoted. There are numerous precedents for making amendments. No person who has the slightest knowledge of the contents of the proposed agreement would state that it conforms to the principles expressed by the President. I unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly state that the terms of the proposed agreement, in practically one-half of

the items enumerated, is in direct violation of the principles stated by the President and that if the President understood the agreement he could not ask us to support it on the principles named by himself.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the Republican Party ever promised anything, it has promised in plain and unequivocal language protection to the farmer. This treaty is a repudiation of that promise, and its ratification will brand the Republican Party as faithless. Not only have the party platforms, including the last one, contained this promise, but campaign literature and speeches have uniformly proclaimed it as one of the cardinal doctrines of the party. The protection granted agriculture by Republican Congresses has, in season and out of season, been pointed to as a fulfillment of this promise. While I am not aware that anyone denies that in the past the party has stood for such protection, it has been claimed by some that the last Republican platform modified the doctrine of protection so that this treaty is not in violation of it. Nothing could be further from the truth. Even if the language of the last platform could by some stretch of imagination be construed so as to permit this treaty, it would still be no less dishonorable for the Republicans to ratify it, because no one can seriously contend that the voting public was aware of any such change. Everybody understood that the party adhered to its former attitude. The argument of those who contend that the ratification of this treaty is not a violation of our party pledges rests upon the false assumption that this platform introduced a new measure of protection, namely, the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and the further claim that there is no substantial difference in the cost of production here and in Canada. A reading of the platform will show anyone that this is not what we declared for. The statement referred to as the measure of protection is practically a copy of the language in the platform of 1904 and is not new.

The last platform does not only declare for a tariff equal to the difference in the cost of production, but also for a tariff in addition thereto of a reasonable profit. Here is the language:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit.

This provision was carefully drawn with a view of excluding from our markets goods that may be offered at mere cost, as the sale of goods at actual cost would soon drive industries needing protection out of business. No industry could long exist without receiving some profit. Even conceding, as is contended, that there is no substantial difference between the cost of production here and in Canada, the American farmer is entitled, under this promise, to a tariff equal to a reasonable profit upon his crops. But the framers of this platform did not stop there; they declared expressly that the Republican policy of protection is to secure against foreign competition. The language is:

The aim and the purpose of the Republican policy being not only to preserve, without excessive duties, the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country.

In the last Republican platform no special mention was made of reciprocity, but in the Republican convention of 1900 the Republican policy in regard to reciprocity was declared in these words:

We favor the associate policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for foreign markets.

This declaration has never been changed. It was readopted in the last section of the last platform, which says that the party reaffirms and adheres to every Republican doctrine proclaimed since the birth of the party. This treaty opens our markets—not to goods we do not produce, but to goods we do produce, and invites instead of prevents ruinous competition. It is indeed surprising that anyone can seriously contend that there is the slightest doubt as to the attitude of the last national convention on this subject, but, be that as it may, in a matter of this kind nothing but the utmost good faith toward those who have trusted us will fulfill our duty. The people have a right to insist that party pledges should be performed as they are generally understood. They will not take kindly to any quibbling.

But they tell us that the farmers have no reason to object, because they say it will not injure them. The President, in his message transmitting this treaty, urges ratification upon the ground that it will reduce the cost of food products. He expresses the idea that the effect will not be a sudden, but gradual, reduction in prices and that it will postpone the effect of future world increase in the prices, which means that this treaty will reduce the price of farm products and prevent our farmers from getting the full benefit of an increase in world prices for what he sells, while he must pay the inevitable in-

crease upon manufactured goods that he must buy. The friends of this treaty tell the consumers in one breath that he is going to get cheaper food products and the farmer in the next breath that his products are not going to be cheaper. No one has attempted to show by what sort of legerdemain this can be accomplished.

The naked proposition is that this treaty has been entered into for the purpose of lowering the price of farm products; and that it will accomplish that purpose no one at all familiar with the situation can doubt. It is undisguised, selfish, class legislation in behalf of the cities as against the producers of food.

This treaty puts practically every farm product of the North on the free list, as Canada is the only country that can successfully compete. No pretense is made that the farmers are to get anything in return except some slight reduction in the duty on lumber. The treaty does not open to the northern farmer a market for a single bushel of grain or any other of his products, but it compels him to compete with Canada for his own market. We might consent to this if there were a corresponding reduction in manufactured products, but extreme care has been taken that no manufacturer shall suffer. As an illustration it might be noted that the miller may buy his wheat in Canada, but the farmer who has got to sell in competition with the Canadian farmer can not buy his flour in Canada without paying 50 cents per barrel tariff. It is claimed, however, that this treaty provides for free lumber. This claim is very misleading. It is true that it gives to the cities free paving blocks, to the railroads free ties and bridge timbers, to the telegraph and telephone companies free poles, and to the brewers free barrel staves, but it does not make free ordinary lumber used for building purposes. Sawed lumber, not planed or matched and grooved, is free, but a substantial duty is retained on all the grades used for ordinary building purposes. The lumber that is free is seldom handled by retail dealers. The planed lumber is so much lighter in weight that transportation charges are enough less to make it much cheaper. It is useless to argue that this reduction, which is a dollar and a quarter a thousand, will affect retail prices. Everybody knows that the lumber dealers are in a combination that absolutely controls prices. This was clearly illustrated a few years ago when the wholesale prices fell some \$6 to \$8 per thousand without affecting the retail price of lumber. This reduction will not affect the price any more than did the like reduction in the Payne tariff law. It will only increase the lumbermen's profit.

Those who claim that this will not injure the farmers say no one can profit by a tariff upon any article of which we export large quantities. Theoretically this is true, but it is not true that we export any large quantity of any of the farm products raised along the northern border. The United States has almost ceased to export barley, flax, oats, hay, potatoes, butter, eggs, cheese, or poultry, and we only occasionally export any wheat raised in Minnesota or the Dakotas, or any flour from such wheat. It is nearly all consumed in the United States. Minneapolis, which received annually more than 100,000,000 bushels of wheat during the last three years, did not export in the aggregate more than \$50,000 worth of wheat and flour all told, and the combined export of Duluth and Superior, cities that receive about as much wheat as Minneapolis, have been reduced to some \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 annually, including the export of flour. Minnesota and the Dakotas produce nearly all the spring wheat in this country, and as spring wheat has some advantages over fall wheat for milling purposes it has made it possible to secure the added price. To the north of Minnesota and the Dakotas is Canada, with a territory now producing more than 100,000,000 bushels of spring wheat annually, of which Winnipeg last year received some 71,000,000 bushels, besides some fall wheat. The price for Canadian wheat of the same character as ours has during a number of years been about 10 cents per bushel lower than Minneapolis and Duluth prices. This advantage to our farmers as against Canadian prices applies to flaxseed and barley as well. Our newspapers have repeatedly called attention to this situation. I notice by the report on this bill that we are going to have millions of bushels of Canadian wheat come into our markets without affecting prices. In explanation it is said that the price is fixed by the Liverpool price. This is not true, as shown by a statement from the Department of Commerce and Labor giving the prices in these different markets. This statement shows that from September 1, 1909, to September 1, 1910, the price of wheat in Minneapolis was, with the exception of a few weeks, when there was a large surplus of grain, about 10 cents higher than the Winnipeg price for the same kind and grade of wheat in store at the Lake ports; and that while this premium existed the price of wheat in Minneapolis was on an average less than 10 cents lower than Liverpool and for three months higher than

Liverpool, though it would cost Minneapolis about twice 10 cents to put it on the Liverpool market. This statement also shows that during this year the flaxseed was about 20 cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg.

When the Payne tariff law was under consideration, some two years ago, the Minneapolis millers filed with the Treasury Department statements showing that Minnesota wheat was about 9 cents higher than Canada, and it was then freely urged that this difference was often greater.

The Commercial West, considered excellent authority, has lately published a statement showing that during the last six months this same difference has been maintained between the price of wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg. It has also been claimed that the price in this country would not be decreased by admitting Canadian farm products, but that Canadian prices would advance to our prices. This contention is contrary to experience. The Canadian price is nearly always the European price less expenses of transportation, and as they double and treble their production of wheat, as they claim they will do, the spread between Liverpool and our prices will grow greater. Tables in the 1908 and 1909 Yearbooks of Agriculture show that the difference in the average farm price of wheat between Minnesota and New York has gradually decreased as competition for the wheat has increased. Prior to 1875 the difference was 75 cents per bushel. This has been reduced, so that in 1909 it was less than half of the cost of transportation from Minneapolis to New York. As long as wheat was freely offered the difference ranged between 20 and 25 cents, so as to permit export, and there is every reason to believe that as soon as the Canadian wheat creates a surplus in our markets the same condition will again exist. I will print the tables from the Department of Commerce and Labor. On examination you will note that during the thrashing season, when much grain is rushed into the market, Liverpool was about 30 cents higher than Minneapolis and Winnipeg, clearly showing the effect of this temporary surplus, and that even Winnipeg for a few days after having disposed of its export wheat was a trifle high for export. It may be urged that this is an unfair condition, but if you will examine the figures you will find that the farmers of the Northwest are only gaining by the tariff about one-third to one-half of the expenses of placing their crops upon the Liverpool market.

In this connection I desire to call your attention to the report of the Select Committee of the Senate on Wages and Prices of Commodities in the United States, dated January 23, 1910, which says, page 13:

Witnesses agree that farming operations were conducted at a loss, or at best with only a slight margin of profit, for several years, and that only during the past two or three years have farmers been able to secure a fair return on their labor and investments. The wealth of the farmers has increased largely through the increase in the value of their land.

The State University of Minnesota has since 1902 kept in the greatest detail record of a number of farms in that State. Allowing the farmer, his wife, and children pay at current rates for all labor performed, the net profits during the three years 1905 to 1907 was only 4.09 per cent, and this profit advanced to about 6 per cent during the years 1908 to 1909. The profit during the past two years approximates the average interest on farm mortgages in the State.

Is there any industry that pays less?

It is claimed that there is no difference between the United States and Canada that will justify a protective tariff. For 50 years or more the American farmer in the North has steadily supported protection to build up a market here, and has consented to pay higher prices for manufactured commodities, so that it might be accomplished. Now, when this market has been built up and the farmers are reaping some advantage in prices by reason of protection, the advantage is to be denied and he is still to go on and pay the price of protected goods for what he is to purchase. If a person should in a private transaction do what is proposed to be done by this treaty, he would earn the contempt of all his neighbors. But there are economic reasons. Our lands are old and in need of fertilizers, while the lands of Canada are new and rich in plant food. This will make it impossible for our farmer to raise as large crops with as little expense as his Canadian competitor. Then, our lands are on an average more than \$30 per acre higher in price. This difference in price at 6 per cent means a difference of more than 10 cents per bushel on the grain raised per acre. Canadian grain is likely to be placed upon our market at as low a rate for freight as our own, because the railways crossing the international boundary are not subject to regulation under our laws.

This unequal competition will probably have much the same effect, though I hope not so serious, as did the opening of our grain fields in the West upon the Eastern farmer. When the Middle West commenced to develop these fields the Eastern farmers were enjoying prosperity, but they soon found it very difficult to compete. Their farms gradually decreased in value,

and much land was entirely abandoned. Take, for instance, the six States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maine, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Their farm lands and improvements lost in value between 1880 and 1890 about \$207,000,000, between 1890 and 1900 another \$99,000,000, making a total loss in 20 years of some \$306,000,000. Over one-third of the farm land that was improved in Connecticut, Maine, and Vermont in 1880 was unimproved in 1900, and one-half of the area of improved farm land in Massachusetts and New Hampshire in 1880 was unimproved in 1900. During this same time many millions of acres of land were abandoned as farms. But this does not represent the total loss due to this competition, because while it was going on great cities were being built in their midst that prevent much of this loss by making the land valuable for gardening and other purposes in which competition was not so severe. This matter is of vital importance to the farmers of this country, not only to those of my section, but throughout the United States. If the farmers of the Northwest are driven out of grain raising they will be compelled to compete with the farmers of other sections in other lines of agriculture. The expenses of growing grain have steadily increased, and unless a fair price is maintained the margin of profit will disappear. One of the largest milling concerns at Minneapolis, the Washburn-Crosby Mills, in an interview opposing this treaty expressed the fear that Canadian competition will drive our farmers out of grain raising, and thus compel their mills to depend entirely on Canadian wheat. If you expect agriculture to prosper, you must allow it fair compensation for its products. You can not expect to keep the boy on the farm if he can only hope to eke out a mere existence.

Those who contend that the conditions in Canada are such that there is no justification for protecting our markets against their products have a curious way of showing the sincerity of their professions. With one or two minor exceptions, for which there are political reasons, they are careful to leave ample protection upon any article manufactured or produced in our cities, and single out the farmers and fishermen as the ones upon whom to practice the creed. If they were sincere they might as well have tried this theory upon some of the articles controlled by a trust. But, oh no, that would not do. These trusts must not be disturbed. It is argued that because of their existence this legislation is justified. Not because the farmers have formed a trust, but because people are up in arms against the extortions of the trusts and that something must be done to satisfy the people. Of course it is not necessary to prevent this extortion; let the farmers make up for the unconscionable profits of these trusts. That was the argument that put hides on the free list and is now used to put other farm products on the free list. If you imagine that you can convince our farmers that your love for the Canadian and not your own love of gain is your reason for supporting this treaty, you will awake to find yourself disappointed. If you think that you can cajole them into the belief that they are not hurt, you simply insult their intelligence. There is no good reason why one class of our producers should have their markets protected against foreign competition while others equally deserving are denied such protection. Protection can only be fair if all are treated alike. The protected countries of Europe recognize the justice of this claim and freely accord protection to their farmers. If this treaty is adopted it will mean a loss to the Northwest of millions of dollars annually, not only to the farmer, but also to the cities and villages. The money received by the farmer for his products goes back to your merchant for his supplies made in your mills, your shops, and factories. You can not injure the farmer without injuring the cities and villages.

It is perfectly plain that some of those favoring this treaty are doing everything they can to misrepresent its nature and effect. You may call their attention to the fact that the threat to put it into effect has already materially reduced the price of farm products, and that under every known law of trade further reductions are inevitable. It is all to no purpose. Many are eager for this reduction; others regret this, but see personal advantages that dominate their course. The millers and elevator men are assured of fortunes in an abundance of cheaper grain; the railroads anticipate added tonnage and added dividends from Canadian products; the newspaper men are promised free print-paper, but all in chorus protest that they are not selfish. These thrifty patriots, hugging a hope of gain from the farmer's loss, assume a haughty air of superiority and extol themselves as great, enlightened statesmen, whose hearts bleed for suffering Canada. In the flush of present triumph they threaten and browbeat all opposition. But let me suggest to them, this is the Cobden corn law. When it is adopted, what further interest has agriculture in protection, and what justification is there for preserving to other industries our markets? If America is willing to get down from its high standard of

living and take its chances in the fierce contest of a world competition, good and well.

Quotations of flaxseed at the Minneapolis, Duluth, and Winnipeg markets from September 26, 1910, to January 23, 1911, as reported by Commercial West.

[Price per bushel.]

Dates.	Minneapolis.	Duluth.	Winnipeg.
1910.			
Sept. 26.....	\$2.70	\$2.78	\$2.48
Oct. 3.....	2.54	2.53	2.15
10.....	2.66½	2.65½	2.44
17.....	2.64	2.64	2.40
24.....	2.57½	2.61	2.39
31.....	2.60½	2.61½	2.43
Nov. 7.....	2.63	2.64	2.45
14.....	2.70	2.74	2.52
21.....	2.59½	2.64½	2.45
28.....	2.54	2.53	2.26
Dec. 5.....	2.55	2.54	2.25
12.....			
19.....			
27.....	2.42	2.37	2.07
1911.			
Jan. 3.....	2.48½	2.47½	2.22
9.....	2.53	2.53	2.26
16.....	2.61	2.61	2.42
23.....	2.63½	2.63½	2.25

¹ October 11 quotation.

² November 1 quotation.

³ November bid.

⁴ December bid.

⁵ January delivery.

Minneapolis cash wheat quotations of Nos. 1 and 2 northern (track), compared with Winnipeg quotations of No. 1 northern "in store," Fort William or Port Arthur terminal elevators, and Liverpool quotations of No. 2 northern Manitoba.

		Wednesday quotations.			Tuesday quotations. Liverpool— No. 2 northern Manitoba.
		Minneapolis.		Winnipeg.	
		No. 1 north- ern.	No. 2 north- ern.		
1909.		Cents per bush.	Cents per bush.	Cts. per bu.	Cts. per bu.
Sept.	1	98½	96 - 96½	97½	125½
	8	97½ - 97½	95½ - 95½	97½	129
	15	99½ - 100½	97½ - 98½	98½	130½
	22	100½ - 100½	98½ - 98½	98	129½
	29	101½	99½	94½	130
Oct.	6	101	99	96½	130½
	13	103½	101½	98½	131½
	20	104½ - 104½	102½ - 102½	97	131
	27	105½ - 105½	103½ - 103½	97½	131
Nov.	3	102 - 102½	100 - 100½	95½	115½
	10	104½ - 104½	102½ - 102½	97½	115½
	17	105½ - 106½	103½ - 104½	98½	
	24	106½ - 107	104½ - 105	99½	117½
Dec.	1	105½ - 106	103½ - 104	94½	118½
	8	109½ - 110	107½ - 108	96½	118½
	15	112 - 112½	110 - 110½	99½	119½
	22	111½ - 112½	109½ - 110½	100½	120½
	29	111½ - 112½	109½ - 110½	100½	119½
1910.					
Jan.	5	114 - 115	112 - 113	103½	122½
	12	114½ - 115½	112½ - 113½	103½	122½
	19	110½ - 111½	108½ - 109½	101½	120½
	26	114 - 114½	112 - 112½	103½	120½
Feb.	2	111½	109½	103	121½
	9	112	109	102½	119½
	16	115½	113½	103½	120½
	23	113½	111½	102½	119½
Mar.	2	114½	112½	103½	119½
	9	114½	112½	104	118½
	16	114½	112½	104½	120½
	23	116½	114½	105½	120½
	30	115½	113½	105½	121½
Apr.	6	110½	108½	104	121½
	13	111	109	103½	119½
	20	107½	105½	100½	117½
	27	109½	107½	99½	117½
May	4	111	109	99½	112½
	11	112½	110½	98½	112½
	18	110	108	96½	109½
	25	109½	107½	92½	104½
June	1	106½	104½	88½	97½
	8	107½	105½	90	102½
	15	106½	104½	89½	99½
	22	111½	109½	93½	102½
	29	115½	113½	100½	107½
July	6	118	116	106	107½
	13	118	116	109½	110½
	20	126½	124½	115½	119½
	27	124½	122½	110½	121½
Aug.	3	117½	114½	106	117½
	10	115½	110	108½	117½
	17	113	109½	110	121½
	24	110½	107½	107½	121½
	31	112½	110½	108½	120½

Liverpool quotations are for the day preceding the date specified in the statement.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, reciprocity is an American doctrine, and in harmony with the commercial spirit of the times. I shall vote for this bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada because I believe it will be in the best interests of the producers and the consumers of our people and the people of Canada, and to some extent it will materially reduce the cost of some of the necessities of life. The only fault I have to find with this reciprocity agreement is that it does not go far enough to meet my views regarding genuine reciprocal trade relations.

However, I desire to say this measure is a step in the right direction and to that extent meets my approval, and hence I reiterate the hope, so often expressed by me, that something will be done substantially ere long to bring about freer commercial relations with our neighbors on the north—the Canadians—and with the progressive people of our sister Republics, in Mexico and in Central and South America.

Here is the true field, it seems to me, for our legitimate expansion of trade, for broader markets, for our industrial endeavors, and for our commercial extension; and now is the time for an exhibition on our part, as the representatives in Congress of the people of the United States, of a little political sagacity and the exercise of good business foresight in the enactment of this legislation that will mean more and more commercially as the years come and go to our producers, to our consumers, to our merchants, to our manufacturers, and to all the people of our country.

For years I have been advocating true reciprocity with our sister countries north and south. As I view the situation, we either attempt to go too far afield on the one hand, seeking trade at great expense in distant lands, or we display a lack of business knowledge and exhibit a narrow provincialism on the other hand, declining trade at our doors, that is as detrimental to our best interests as it is deplorable in our statesmanship. Canada, Mexico, Central and South America are our neighbors and our real friends, and they should be our best customers; and they would be our best customers if we only had the commercial sense and the political wisdom to deal with them aboveboard, in the spirit of trade equality, and treat them fairly and reciprocally along lines mutually advantageous.

Sir, the statistics conclusively show that this trade at our very doors is growing more important and becoming more valuable every year. Why should we ignore it? European countries are doing their best to secure it, and the facts prove that they are getting the most of it at the present time, very much to our detriment and to our disadvantage. Why will our people always be blind commercially to their own best interests and to their own greatest opportunities? Why spend millions of dollars seeking trade in the Orient when the commerce of the Occident—richer than the Indies—is knocking at our door? Let us obliterate the obstacles, tear down the barriers, and open wide the doors to welcome the commerce of North and South and Central America, on land and sea, ere it is too late and the opportunity to secure it be lost forever. Now is the accepted time. These countries are anxiously awaiting the outcome of our deliberations. They are watching the enactment of this legislation. They long for some evidence of our friendship and sincerity. They want to trade with us. They will meet us more than halfway. Shall we disappoint their most sanguine expectations? Shall we ignore this most valuable trade, these great commercial opportunities, and give these splendid markets wholly and entirely to foreign countries? I trust not; and so I say again that I hope, ere we adjourn, the pending bill will become a law.

Mr. Chairman, the people of these countries to our north and to our south are the true friends of the people of the United States; they look to us for protection, for sisterly sympathy, for a reciprocal exchange of products; they need our help in their industrial progress; they desire our aid in the marketing of their exports; they appeal to us for financial assistance in the development of their great natural resources; and their resources and their products are greater and richer than those of countries far away across the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans. We should aid them in their struggle for better conditions. We should extend to them a helping hand in their onward march of progress. We should glory in their prosperity. Their success is our success. They are rapidly forging to the front; their exports and their imports are increasing annually; their trade is becoming more and more important, their commerce more and more valuable; and instead of closing our doors by tariff barriers against these countries and their products, in my opinion, we should open them wider and do everything in our power to facilitate closer trade and commercial relations. We want their products and they want our products, and all restrictions to prevent a fairer and freer exchange of goods, wares,

and merchandise should, in so far as possible, be eliminated. It will be for the best interest of the people of the United States, of lasting benefit to our neighbors to the north and to the south, and for the mutual advantage of each and every country on this hemisphere, binding us together in closer ties of friendship and making for the peace and the prosperity and the industrial progress of the times.

Mr. PUJO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill under consideration and to the reciprocity treaty recently negotiated and entered into by the State Department representing the United States of America and the Canadian ministers on the part of the Dominion of Canada, for the primary reason that the manner in which the trade agreement was entered into and the manner in which it was brought to the consideration of Congress is, according to my view, violative of both the letter and spirit of our Federal Constitution.

Section 1, Article I, of the Constitution says:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

While it was true that the Congress of the United States is ostensibly considering the provisions of the bill writing into law the reciprocal agreement entered into by the President with the Dominion of Canada, yet in truth and in fact, this bill is not being considered with due regard for orderly procedure, in that the President of the United States not only initiated and originated the measure, but the power of his great office is recognized and felt in this Chamber as one of the strongest arguments in favor of its enactment into law.

Under the Constitution, a treaty involving the raising of revenue could not be negotiated by the President and would be of no force and effect as authority for the collection of revenue.

Yet the Canadian reciprocity treaty which we are called on to ratify without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," is brought before us in a manner never contemplated by the Constitution and clearly beyond its sanction.

Under our theory of government, as I understand it and as it is expressed in our organic law, all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives.

Article I, section 7, reads as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

The reason for the inclusion of this mandatory provision in the Constitution, was to lodge the power to tax the people in the Representatives chosen by them for that purpose. The very next section of the Constitution emphasizes the limitations as to this power being vested in any other coordinate branch of the Government, as it says:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

It can not for one moment be contended, but that the treaty under consideration, and which the Congress is called on to ratify, lays and collects taxes and duties. Hence, the House of Representatives and the Senate should be jealous of the exclusive privilege vested in the former to originate bills raising the revenue and, in both, vesting the power to lay and collect taxes and duties.

Mr. Chairman, the appetite grows on what it feeds. If the Chief Executive of the United States be permitted to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with the Dominion of Canada, laying and collecting taxes and raising revenue, he will no doubt feel encouraged by the approval of his course and will enter into similar agreements with other countries, and thereby radically change the economic policies of our Government with reference to our commercial relations with other nations of the world. It is no stretch of the imagination to suggest the thought, that in the near future, we may be confronted by a reciprocal trade agreement negotiated by this Government with the Republic of Cuba admitting sugar free into this country, or greatly reducing the rate of duty thereon for some imaginary compensatory general benefit to result to the consumer. The same suggestion follows in its logical order with reference to a reciprocal trade agreement with Japan and China, admitting rice into this country without duty thereon in compensation for similar treatment to agricultural implements or some of the manufactures of the Atlantic seaboard.

We are confronted with this condition to-day with reference to rough lumber, which is to be permitted to come into the United States from the Dominion of Canada without paying a duty.

The thoughts just expressed were dictated yesterday, and in confirmation of these views I find in a local morning paper, the Washington Herald, the following comments on the speeches

made by President Taft and my distinguished leader, Mr. CLARK, Speaker of the Sixty-second Congress, before the Pan-American Commercial Conference, which I now read:

President Taft and CHAMP CLARK, Speaker to be, announce they favor world-wide reciprocity.

Statements received with enthusiasm by delegates representing trade interests of Pan America.

Further:

In this connection it was learned yesterday that informal discussions are already taking place between representatives of the State Department and the Mexican ambassador with a view to opening the way to reciprocity negotiations with that country. The Mexican proposition has not taken definite form as yet, but an effort is being made to ascertain the views of the Mexican Government in regard to it.

Mr. Chairman, free trade with Mexico in competitive raw material should produce grave apprehension in the minds of nearly every Representative in the House. As you are aware, Mexico has potential possibilities as a producer of raw material. Her plains are covered with cattle and horses; great forests of timber of all useful kinds are to be found there; her mines, although yet almost undeveloped, can be made to produce fabulous wealth; her fields yield products of all kinds, and it would be absolutely impossible for an American citizen to compete with importations from Mexico.

The principal producing labor of the Republic of Mexico consists of peons and it is conducted and maintained under a system which is so repugnant to the people of the United States that this Government has even manifested its disapproval of such conditions by the enactment of a law punishing severely anyone guilty of the offense of peonage. If it be true that the President of the United States is initiating negotiations with the ambassador from Mexico, looking to a free trade reciprocal agreement, we will suffer great damage in the State of Louisiana. Sugar will be brought in competition, resulting not only in the destruction or impairment of the great industry in that State, but one from which the customs duty collected for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, amounted to \$52,000,000. It may strike down the rice industry producing an annual crop in Louisiana and Texas of \$20,000,000 a year about equally divided between the two States, and in which approximately \$200,000,000 is dependent, either by direct investment or in investments depending upon rice culture. And as to its probable effect on the lumber industry, I quote from a speech delivered by me in this House on the 31st of March, 1909, when the Payne tariff bill was under consideration, as conditions have changed but little since that time:

The State of Louisiana manufactures more yellow-pine lumber than any other State in the Union.

It converts more cypress into lumber than any other of the United States.

It is second in production in the manufacture of sawed lumber in the United States.

The district that I have the honor to represent upon this floor is the largest yellow-pine district in the United States. The assessment of timber lands in the State of Louisiana for the purpose of taxation for the year 1908, on an approximate 50 per cent basis, was nearly \$80,000,000. The assessment for the same purpose in my district, upon the same basis, exceeded \$32,000,000. Thus it will be seen that the State of Louisiana in taxable values in timber alone, upon the basis mentioned by me, has \$160,000,000 worth therein, and my district sixty-four million.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of this discussion, I assume the following facts as established, round numbers only being given:

Sawmills reporting in the United States	28,850
Quantity of lumber manufactured	40,256,154,000
Value	\$666,641,367
Laths	3,663,602,000
Value	\$10,342,705
Shingles	11,824,475,000
Value	\$30,111,337
Aggregating a reported value of lumber, laths, and shingles for 1907	\$707,095,409

Further, going into details on this subject, in so far as the State of Louisiana is concerned, of the totals above given we have from that State 531 sawmills reporting, producing 2,972,119,000 feet, of a total value of \$48,638,256, of which 2,345,912 feet was of yellow pine, of the value of \$34,402,894.

The next principal item of lumber manufacture was cypress, aggregating 509,665,000 feet, of the total value of \$11,734,044.

The output of hard woods in that State was 116,542,000 feet, of the value of \$2,501,318.

The Bulletin of Forest Products, No. 2, compiled in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, by Gifford Pinchot, United States Forester, issued November 18, 1908, from which the foregoing figures have been taken and to which further reference will be made, shows the average value of yellow-pine lumber, in a manufactured state at the mill ready for shipment, per 1,000 feet board measure, in Louisiana, to be \$14.67, and the average value of the same grade of lumber throughout the United States \$14.02.

The cost of production varies in different States owing to what we might term the "lay of the land." Where logging is done in a mountainous country, the cost of bringing the timber to the mills is much more than in the South, where the land is level and log railways can be more cheaply constructed. The cost of production of lumber in Louisiana ready for shipment approximates \$11. So it is obvious that the profit is very small, the actual value, as before stated, averaging in the year 1907 \$14.67.

As a matter of fact, in the year 1908 several of the large sawmills in my district were compelled to suspend operations, throwing hundreds

of employees out of work. They were unable to dispose of the product at a profit, and the results of operations would have been to use up their stumpage and carry on business at a loss.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated in the forceful argument of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] that there are employed in the sawmills in the timber industry of the United States some 800,000 men, and that directly dependent upon this industry are some 2,500,000 people. In the State of Louisiana, in the sawmills alone, by reference to Table 2 of Bulletin 77, from the Census of Manufactures, 1905, Lumber and Timber Products, we find the following aggregates given under "Wage earners and wages": "Average number, 26,353, and wages, \$12,129,065."

And referring to Table 6, same bulletin, in the logging camps, men from 16 years and over, the average number was 8,498; wages paid, \$3,965,588. I have not the exact figures for the employees engaged in the production of lumber from the felling of the tree to its shipment from the mill for the year 1907, yet it is fair to assume that they have increased 20 per cent over 1905, showing for my own State, say, 41,821, receiving an approximate wage of \$19,313,583.

During the course of the debate as to whether lumber should retain the present duty, or be reduced 50 per cent, or placed upon the free list, inquiry has been made as to where the loss would fall. I am strongly persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that the principal portion of the loss would be imposed upon labor. I am not alone in this opinion, because I have been requested by hundreds and hundreds of laborers in my district, by petition, filed with the Committee on Ways and Means, to vote against a reduction in the duty upon lumber, as they believed it would be followed by a corresponding reduction in wages.

The average wage rate in Louisiana is \$2 per day. The average wage rate in my district is \$2 per day. Should lumber be placed upon the free list, I believe that it would result in a reduction of wages to a point at least 20 per cent lower than the present level, resulting in a loss to labor in my State of nearly \$3,500,000; and should the duty be reduced 50 per cent, just half that amount—\$1,750,000—40 per cent of which would be borne by the employees in my district.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the attempted reduction of the tariff on lumber will be violative of all principles of justice and equity to the laborer, to the manufacturer, and to the man who uses the commodity last—the consumer. Should this bill be enacted into law, its operation upon the sawmill man will be, in part, as follows: His lumber and shingles will be upon the free list, and nearly everything he has to buy is protected, to wit:

A tariff picture of the sawmill man; what he buys on the high end of the tariff list; what he sells on the free list.

Name of article.	Rate of tariff.
What he sells:	
Lumber.....	On the free list.
Shingles.....	Do.
What he buys:	
Engines (stationary).....	30 per cent.
Engines (locomotive).....	Do.
Bollers.....	Do.
Machinery in general, not otherwise specified.....	Do.
Saws—	
Circular.....	25 per cent.
Crosscut.....	6 cents per foot.
Drag.....	8 cents per foot.
Hand.....	30 per cent.
Mill.....	10 cents per foot.
Pit.....	8 cents per foot.
Steel band.....	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.
All not specifically mentioned.....	30 per cent.
Belt—	
Rubber.....	45 per cent.
Cotton or other fiber.....	Do.
Leather belts, ready for use.....	35 per cent.
Leather, for belts not ready for use.....	20 per cent.
Axes.....	45 per cent.
Hatchets.....	Do.
Chains—	
Log.....	1½ cents per pound.
Small.....	1½ cents per pound.
Iron or steel wire cables.....	1 cent per pound.
Rope, hemp.....	2 cents per pound.
Locomotives, forgings for.....	35 per cent.
Steel railway rails.....	Do.
Piping, wrought iron or steel.....	Do.
Oil, lubricating (?).....	Do.
Harness for horses.....	45 per cent.
Horseshoes.....	1 cent per pound.
Horseshoe nails.....	2½ cents per pound.
Horses.....	20 per cent ad valorem.
Mules.....	Do.
Hay.....	\$4 per ton.

Mr. HOWLAND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PUJO. Certainly.

Mr. HOWLAND. I understand you insist on protection. Against whom do you desire to be protected?

Mr. PUJO. I am insisting upon a duty against the lumber from Canada, where labor is cheaper, and because it is cheaper the people of the North who have grown rich, and whose forests are now denuded, are actuated by selfish motives and desire the timber of the South placed in competition with free Canadian lumber, so that they may buy the Canadian lumber cheaper than they can buy the lumber of the South.

Mr. HOWLAND. Is not the gentleman aware that he is shipping his longleaf yellow pine into Canada to-day, and that they produce none there, and that it is not a competing product?

Mr. PUJO. I am perfectly aware that we can ship into Canada about 20 per cent of our product, the highest grade, because we can ship that anywhere in the world. We are shipping such grade to Hamburg and Havre and other foreign ports.

Mr. HOWLAND. In competition with the lumber of foreign countries?

Mr. PUJO. Yes; but the gentleman does not seem to understand that at least 60 per cent of our product goes into common stock, which we ship into Indiana, Illinois, Connecticut, and even Michigan, where they used to get it from the Saginaw Valley. Now they want to buy it

from Canada, because they have no more timber and they do not want to buy it from the South. They want to save that extra dollar or two a thousand if they can.

Mr. HOWLAND. There is no longleaf yellow pine in Canada, is there? Mr. PUJO. No; but there is plenty of timber that will come in competition with at least 60 per cent of our product. Now, further in this connection, the placing of lumber upon the free list will reduce our market zone. We can not reach the territory that we are reaching to-day with lumber from the South, but, on the contrary, we will be placed in competition with the accumulated common stock coming from the adjacent territory, and within a radius of probably 300 miles from the Canadian border we shall not be able to sell our lumber.

Mr. HINSHAW. It has been frequently said that free lumber would not give us any benefit in Nebraska. Do you ship your lumber into Nebraska, and would the Canadian lumber come in competition with yours there?

Mr. PUJO. I am not exactly familiar with the extent of our lumber trade in the western markets, but I do say this, that we buy your Nebraskan hay, upon which you have a duty of \$4 a ton. You are not in favor of free lumber, are you?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. We sell our hay at \$4 a ton, notwithstanding the duty.

Mr. PUJO. I understand; but if we had no duty on hay, we might be able to get it at \$2 a ton for the mules and horses that we have to use in logging operations in our State.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, my good Democratic friend and brother does not mean to argue on the floor of this House that a duty of \$4 a ton on hay materially affects its price in this country?

Mr. PUJO. Well, I do. I think if you do not have a duty on hay, that hay could be produced in Brazil and shipped here and destroy the hay market to the same extent as if it had been saturated with oil and set on fire.

I will state to my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] that, in my honest judgment, if we did not have a 20 per cent ad valorem duty on mules, that we need in our logging and sugar operations, mules could be raised in Brazil, the finest stock and crop growing country in the world, and we would be able to buy mules that we now pay \$200 apiece for in Kentucky and Missouri for a much lower price. But we do not believe in that doctrine in the State of Louisiana. [Applause.] I want to be perfectly consistent. The State of Louisiana is rich in her natural productions, and her Representatives you find, as a rule, consistent. They not only want a duty upon that which is produced in Louisiana, but they are willing to vote a reasonable duty upon that which is produced in other States. [Applause.]

I feel that I represent the interests of my people by taking such a position. I do not consider it the duty of a Representative to come here and argue that you should take care of that which is in his district and protect it by a tax, whether for revenue or protection, and then vote everything else in everybody else's district free.

I am amazed and astounded that a Representative, for instance, from a prairie State, where, perhaps, cattle are raised in large numbers, does not want hides upon the free list, but, forsooth, wants lumber upon the free list. Louisiana will vote with the Representatives from Missouri and Kentucky for a duty on mules, will vote with the Representative from Texas for a duty on hides, and with the Representative from Kansas for a duty on his hay or corn. Every industry which can be destroyed by a removal of duty, even if a fair measure of protection results, I will stand here and vote for.

I do not understand how a Representative from the South, when his own section will be injured most by the removal of the duty upon lumber—Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina, and South Carolina—I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, how it is that a man sent here to represent the interests of his country could for one moment listen to the seductive arguments of those who have interests in the Dominion of Canada, and vote for a bill which will injure a great industry in the South, and particularly in the States of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas.

In this connection I want to emphasize the fact, as was stated by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], that the ad valorem duty on lumber is the lowest upon the schedule. The actual value, as shown by the table above referred to, per thousand feet, board measure, is \$14.02, giving a tariff rate under the present schedule of about 14.22 per cent ad valorem, and should the duty be split in two, the rate will be reduced to 7.11 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the present duty on wood and its manufactures to be a revenue-producing one, for, in 1907, the revenue from that source exceeded some \$3,700,000, and on lumber \$1,600,000. Hence, a Democrat who believes in a tariff for revenue only ought to find no embarrassment in voting for the maintenance of the Dingley schedules on lumber.

But independently of that fact, I am in favor of a fair duty upon every article imported into the United States which may be produced here, provided that such rates shall not be prohibitive. In other words, I believe in a duty equal to the difference between the cost of production plus transportation. Now, I am perfectly aware that some of my colleagues on this side of the House will assert that it is not the function of the Government to guarantee a profit to anyone who may be engaged in an enterprise. That is perfectly true; but I consider this a misstatement of the case. I believe it to be the duty of the Government, when the question of the welfare of its citizens is to be weighed in the balance with those of other countries, that there should be no discrimination against our own citizens. So my views on the question of the imposition of a tariff tax are that the representatives of the people owe it to them to so legislate that no citizens of a foreign country shall be permitted to offer for sale in this country any competitive article under conditions more favorable than is enjoyed by an American citizen. It has been my intention to be entirely frank with my colleagues upon this question.

The views I express to-day I have entertained for many years, as is well known to the people of my State and district. Louisiana is a State great in the production of raw material. She leads in cane sugar; in the output of yellow pine; is second in the United States in timber production; and is a large producer of cotton. She produces practically half of the rice in the United States; one-third of the sulphur of the world; and her people do not subscribe to the doctrine that the raw material must be free and the finished product protected.

It should not be lost sight of, that the bill under consideration carrying this treaty into effect, places nearly everything that is produced upon the farm, or embraced in the general

term of husbandry, upon the free list, but we find that manufactured goods do not have to bear such a burden. We are told, no doubt with sincerity, that under the terms of this agreement wood pulp and print paper will be brought into the United States free of duty, thereby inviting the support of the great molders of public opinion, the powerful newspapers of this country, who have always claimed that the duty on wood pulp and print paper was a tax on knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, it is asserted without contradiction that under the form of Government of the Dominion of Canada, the Provinces alone have the right to adopt the regulations upon which Crown timber can be exported from that country, and it is now claimed by those who have made a close investigation of the subject that there is an export tax on such exportations, and under the provisions of this treaty wood pulp and print paper would not be entitled to its benefits.

I have singled out two or three of the great agricultural and industrial products of this country, because it so happens that I am relatively familiar with their importance to the consumer and of their revenue-producing qualities. It has been stated in this Chamber, with some degree of assurance, that the tax upon agricultural products is merely a stalking horse used to approach and capture the vote of the farmer, that such a tax produced nothing to help maintain the Government; but, Mr. Chairman, the figures show that for the fiscal year 1910 there was collected on cane-sugar importations, not above 16 Dutch standard, \$52,677,757; on cane sugar above 16 Dutch standard, \$60,044; on rice importations, \$1,458,307; on rough lumber, \$1,600,000; on wood and the manufactures of wood, upon which the duty has been reduced, \$1,448,000 (estimated).

It may be urged that some of these items are not affected by the treaty, but, Mr. Chairman, under the precedents sought to be established by the ratification of this trade agreement every article upon the dutiable list from which a revenue is derived to help sustain and maintain this Government may, in a very short time, be the subject of a similar trade agreement, and then ultimately driven from the dutiable list by the power of the Chief Executive, who would have sufficient pride of opinion to have his views enacted into law. The provisions of this treaty and this bill, in my opinion, will operate not only sectionally, but against certain classes of our peoples.

The Members of this House, representing more than 90,000,000 people, have no right to legislate in the interest of the manufacturer of agricultural implements, foodstuffs, clothing, and other necessities of life and against those engaged in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, you have, no doubt noted, that the farmers of the United States are almost as a unit opposed to the adoption of this treaty, and it seems to me that they are the best judges of whether gain or loss will result from its enforcement.

It seems fair to conclude, looking at this question from its four corners, that the opposition to this treaty is almost universal, except on the part of those who believe in free trade per se and those who know that they are favored by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, one of the immortal commentators on the weakness of human nature truly said:

When self the wavering balance hold,
It's rarely right adjusted.

And, without saying this in a spirit of criticism, I fear that the section of the country from which comes the principal cry for the enactment of this legislation will fall within the warning of the truism just quoted.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that when the Democratic Party found itself partially restored to power and on the way to come into its own again in all three departments of the Government that we would base our claim before the American people for a longer tenure of power upon the fact that we would endeavor to carry out in letter and in spirit the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and restore all power where it was lodged by that great instrument—in the hands of the Representatives legally chosen by the electors of the country.

Let us, therefore, have due regard for the orderly administration of our public affairs. If reciprocity with Canada is a good thing for those engaged in the production of the articles placed upon the free list in this treaty it could as well be said to be a good thing for everything produced in that country and in ours. Should such be the case, the proper way to arrive at the solution of the problem is for a careful investigation to be made of the differences of cost of production and manufacture there and production and manufacture here. The House recently passed an act authorizing the creation of a tariff board for such purpose. Information could be gathered by this board and then submitted to Congress and legislation carrying the same into

effect be inaugurated in the House of Representatives, where the Federal Constitution locates the power.

In concluding my remarks in opposition to the enactment into law of this bill ratifying the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, I summarize and restate my objections:

1. The Constitution of the United States never intended that the Chief Executive should enter into reciprocal trade agreements laying and collecting taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.
2. The Constitution of the United States vests in the House of Representatives the sole power of originating bills raising revenue.
3. The Constitution confers the exclusive right upon Congress—the House and the Senate—to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.
4. The bill in its details, is sectional, un-American, and undemocratic—

Sectional, in that by its provisions the manufacturers of the East and Northwest are the principal beneficiaries.

Un-American, in that by its provisions the hand of the tax-gatherer will fall heavily upon the user of manufactured goods and some of the prime necessities of life, such as flour and meat.

Undemocratic, in that by its provisions it embodies class legislation of the most vicious character, taking care of the manufacturer of many of the necessities of life at the expense of the farmer, the producer of our foodstuffs.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as a southern farmer and Representative of one of the largest agricultural districts in Georgia, I am in favor of this reciprocity agreement with Canada. It is a Democratic principle, a Republican conversion. Democracy has declared that the principal cause of the high cost of living is the Republican protective tariff, and the antagonism and pleadings of the Republican high-tax leaders to this bill verifies this statement. It is indeed amusing to hear their plaintive ditties in behalf of the farmer, the class of all classes that protection has oppressed by granting Government aid to so-called "infant industries" of corporation maturity, with accumulated millions in their coffers. You can not, at this crucial moment, deceive the farmer by cries of injustice and class legislation. It is as absurd as it is deceptive. In all these years of Republican power you have only attempted to quiet the farmer into acquiescence with a mess of pottage, hush money, but he has awakened from his lethargy. He reads, he thinks, and he will act. He is no longer an unsuspecting, confiding voter, wielded by promises violated and pledges broken. It is true in some indifferent way on a few articles you have levied an infinitesimal tax, claiming thereby you have protected the producer. In your pleadings he reads between the lines and will not obey your mandates.

The southern farmer needs no protection. He demands none. What he does demand is equal rights to all and special privilege to none. He demands that agricultural implements of all kinds, a necessity for the economical production of his corn, wheat, rye, oats, and cotton, be not taxed to the extent that they can be sold abroad cheaper than he can purchase them at home, within calling distance of the manufacturer's shop. He demands the same on his clothes, hats, and shoes. He does not demand protection on the necessities of life, though he is a producer. Combines and trusts are the result of protection, and combines and trusts created by a protective tariff are the grafters that have ridden the farmer and have made him a hewer of wood and a drawer of water—a galley slave of protected kings. He is determined to throw off the yoke of oppression, stand firm, break the shackles, and demand and get his rights. He well knows this bill does not give him full justice, but he is neither deaf to reason nor blind to facts. Results he wants. He sees that this is a step in the right direction, and, when taken, it means another advanced step in the right direction, and that finally he will receive his reward in complete tariff reduction. Your cries for the farmer are forced tears. They burn your cheeks as they flow. Oh, ye agricultural hypocrites!

Mr. YOUNG of New York. I have always been a protectionist and a Republican, and have always maintained that the measure of protection should be the difference between the cost of production here and abroad plus a reasonable profit, so that our workmen, whether in the factory, furnace, or field, should receive wages in keeping with the American mode of life, which is on a higher plane than anywhere else in the world. I think this is the principle and platform of the Republican Party, and I stand on it to-day.

The reciprocity measure which we are asked to approve is not contrary to the policy of the Republican Party, but is in line with its action, which has always been to lead in the interest of all the people rather than to follow, which is the case

in the measure before use. I have for many years been an advocate of reciprocal treaty relations where it would benefit our people without injury to the farmers, manufacturers, and wage earners of the land. I have no sympathy with those Members on this side of the House who read disaster to American interests or to the Republican Party if the reciprocity treaty with Canada should be adopted. After the treaty has been in operation six months I am confident that no one, whether he be a farmer, manufacturer, or merchant in this country, will feel that he has been injuriously affected. It may be that in some localities there may be a temporary very small reduction in price of farm products, but the difference in price of farm products in Canada and the United States is so insignificant that it can have no permanent serious effect.

In a speech delivered on this floor on the 21st of May, 1910, I showed that the prevailing retail prices in Detroit, Mich., and Windsor, Canada, on that day were in many instances higher in Windsor than in Detroit. I shall reproduce this schedule of prices in the two cities in the RECORD, as I do not care to burden you with them at this time, but conditions have not materially changed in the 10 months.

Summary of prices in Windsor and Detroit.

	Windsor.	Detroit.
	Cents.	Cents.
Homemade headcheese.....	10	10-15
Selected corn beef.....per pound..	10	7-8-10
Finest hamburger steak.....do.....	10	9-10
Prime rib roast of beef.....do.....	12-13	11-12
Porterhouse steak.....do.....	16-17	14-15
Sirloin steak.....do.....	15	12-14
Round steak.....do.....	12-13	13
Leg of lamb.....do.....	16	15-16
Roast fillet of veal.....do.....	12-16	12-15
Cutlets of veal.....do.....	15	16-18
Stewing veal.....do.....	8-10	10
Roast pork.....do.....	15	16
Pork chops.....do.....	16-18	17
Forequarter pork.....do.....	13	13
Leaf lard.....do.....	14-15	12-15
Front quarter lamb.....do.....	12-13	13-14
Hind quarter lamb.....do.....	15	15
Bacon.....do.....	20	18-20
Ham.....do.....	17	15-17
Bologna.....do.....	10	15
Pork sausage.....do.....	12-13	12-17
Liver.....do.....	10	6
Oysters.....per quart.....	50	40
Cranberries.....do.....	12-13	(⁹)
Hinkel's buckwheat flour.....per package..	25	(⁹)
Fresh eggs.....per dozen.....	35	27-28
Fancy white potatoes.....per bushel.....	60	45-49
Grape fruit.....do.....	(⁹)	10
Extra fancy butter.....per pound.....	30	32
Seeded raisins.....per package.....	12-13	7-8
Flour.....per sack.....	75	68
Sauer kraut.....per quart.....	10	7
Granulated sugar.....per pound.....	(⁹)	(⁹)

¹ Three pounds for 25 cents.

² Two quarts for 15 cents.

³ Three packages for 25 cents.

⁴ Three for 25 cents.

⁵ Eighteen pounds for \$1.

⁶ Ten pounds for 47 cents.

I believe that upon the adoption of the treaty the demand for Canadian farm products will materially increase and Canadian prices will advance until they are on a parity with those on this side of the border.

The high prices of food products is not due to the excessive prices asked or received by the farmers. On the contrary, I do not feel that the farmer has received anything like his share of the profits on his products. I have noted carefully what the president of the Grange has to say about the disastrous effect that would come from the adoption of the treaty, but I think he overlooks the fact that the consumer is in no way responsible for the meager earnings of the farmer. The trouble lies with the transportation company and the middleman, and this matter should be taken up by the farmers themselves. If they will unite, as all other trades have united and will insist upon fair prices for everything they produce, they can secure it, notwithstanding the strong monopolies which oppose them.

It is almost an absurdity that the farmer should be paid 3 cents per quart for milk delivered at the country railroad station in New York and that milk should be delivered at my door the following morning in the city at 10 cents per quart, and it certainly seems as though the transportation companies and the milk dealers were getting an abnormal share of the profits. This does not apply to milk alone, but to all products. I remember last year when in Michigan or Wisconsin potatoes were selling at 10 cents per bushel, while in New York they were retailing at 50 cents per bushel.

It has been stated from time to time for many years past that when excessive supplies of farm products were accumulated in New York and there was danger of flooding the market

and breaking the prices, that fruit and vegetables were destroyed or the commission men in the city advised the farmers not to ship them, as there was no remunerative market for them.

I am to-day informed that in Pennsylvania eggs are selling at 18 cents per dozen; poultry, 11 cents per pound; butter, 23 cents per pound; potatoes, 50 cents per bushel; quarters of beef, 8 cents to 10 cents per pound; dressed pork, 10½ cents per pound; milk, 5 cents per quart; wheat, 88 cents per bushel; rye, 60 cents per bushel; oats, 34 cents per bushel; live steers, 5½ cents per pound; live veal calves, 7½ cents per pound.

I take the ground that the prices of food products are not affected by legislation, but only by supply and demand. This can be best illustrated by the putting of hides on the free list when the Payne tariff bill was enacted into law. Immediately the bill became a law, trade, which had been languishing during the consideration of that measure, revived amazingly. The demand for all descriptions of goods increased enormously, and as a result hides advanced more than 15 per cent, and for a year after the Payne tariff law became operative hides were higher than they were before the duty was taken off, and the cattlemen who feared that hides would be so cheap that it would not pay to transport them and that they would rot on the plains, found that they could realize more for them than they had for many years.

I want to say to my friends on this side of the House that I fear the defeat of this treaty will mean the defeat of the Republican Party and of the protection policy, because it is not a sectional measure, it is not a party measure, but a measure in the interest of all the people, who have been demanding some legislation which they think will reduce the cost of living. This has been the demand of the people of this country for two years, and I think was responsible for the defeat of the Republican Party in the late elections in many sections of the country. We should not allow the Democratic Party to take to itself the credit for this measure. The proposition comes from a Republican President, who is a protectionist, who stands for all the principles of protection, and who does not feel that he is doing violence to the principles of the Republican Party in presenting and supporting this measure, and I appeal to my Republican friends to lay aside all petty considerations and stand together for this measure.

It has been said on the floor of this House that there are articles on which the English preferential rates are lower, but if those calling attention to this fact will consider the matter they will find that those articles are of minor importance and will not affect prices in this country, but I make the statement that the rates fixed on the various articles are fair and reasonable and are in conformity with the demands of the inhabitants of the country.

I believe that the adoption of this treaty will hurt no American interest and should be adopted without hesitation. On the other hand, I feel that its defeat by Republican assistance to the Democratic Party would be looked upon as a betrayal of the interests of the people and an ignorance of their reasonable request.

As for the Canadians, as was shown in the able address of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], they are kindred people; they speak our own language; they think our own thoughts; they live lives similar to ours; they are our neighbors, our friends. If either can be benefited by an interchange of products, whether of factory or field, it should be welcomed by both. This Republican Congress has before it an opportunity which has not been given it in a long time to meet the reasonable request of the American people.

You all know that the United States and Canada are divided by a surveyor's line, which should never be considered a stone wall over which neither could climb, but hands should be clasped across the border, and we should in every way court friendship, good will, and commercial intercourse with our brother on the other side. Who knows what will be the future relations between the United States and Canada? We have in the short period of 50 years grown from a Nation of 30,000,000 to more than 90,000,000. Fifty years hence the population of the United States will probably be 200,000,000, and the American people will cross the border in steadily increasing numbers, so that the population of the Dominion is likely to be made up largely of Americans, possibly a majority, and who can tell what may come through the friendly relationship with the mother country of both the United States and Canada? It seems as though in the course of time—it may be 50 years, it may be 100 years, but ultimately—that the American Continent will be one people, living under one flag, and by her influence bring about amity throughout the world, which is the desire of all thinking, God-fearing men.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the bill now under consideration, providing for reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada, for the reason that it is directly against the policy of the grand old party enunciated in the platform adopted at Chicago in 1908. It is a thrust at protection, which the Republican Party has stood for from the birth of the party up to this day. Under that policy the party has won victory after victory, and with that policy enacted into law and placed upon the statute books this country has grown and prospered as no other country under the sun has done. Under that policy factories of every description throughout the length and breadth of this country have been able to earn a fair profit, after paying to the wage earners the highest wages paid in any country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a farmer in my district, irrespective of politics, but what is opposed to putting the products of the farm, and the cattle, hogs, and sheep upon the free list. In addition to that, capitalists from the great State of Ohio have come into the district which I have the honor to represent and have invested \$4,000,000 in forests and in erecting a pulp-paper mill, which gives employment, in the mills and in the forest, to from two to three thousand men at wages higher than have ever been paid heretofore in that section. In addition to that, almost every farmer in the rural section of western North Carolina owns his own home and owns more or less forest, and under existing circumstances there to-day the farmers have a good market not only for the products of their farms and dairies, but for every conceivable kind of timber known to the forests.

These farmers are not rich in this world's goods, but they own their own cottages and homes, which are as sacred to them as the palace of a prince or the mansion of a millionaire, and they love the party which, by protecting their products, has enabled them to find a market and which has made them independent, though not rich. And, although my district was included in the general Democratic wave that swept the country last fall, the farmer was too sensible and too patriotic, as a rule, to vote against his own prosperity and the prosperity of his country. It was the vote of the cities and towns that put my district for the next two years in the Democratic column, as was the case generally throughout the country.

That great pulp-paper mill consumes various kinds of timber in the manufacture of paper, to wit, chestnut, basswood, white poplar, cottonwood, maple, old field pine, spruce, hemlock, balsam, and other timber. Their pay roll amounts to thousands upon thousands of dollars monthly to the wage earners of my district.

Mr. Chairman, the great pulp-paper industry of this country is one of the country's greatest industries. It is estimated that this industry employs in the mills and in the forests something like 500,000 honest, horny-handed sons of toil, receiving wages of from \$1.25 to \$7 and \$8 per day. Now, who is it that is agitating the placing of pulp print paper upon the free list? It is the metropolitan papers and magazines of this country, who have made millions out of their publications. If this bill should prevail and pulp print paper should be placed on the free list these papers and magazines will not lower the price of their publications one cent to their subscribers, neither will they lower the price of their advertisements to the business interests of the country, but the difference will go deep down into their pockets at the expense of the capitalists who have invested their money in the pulp and paper enterprises and at the expense of the 500,000 wage earners now employed in operating these mills and cutting wood in the forests for the mills.

Mr. Chairman, there are a large number of lumber plants in my district—most of them independent plants—that have been running since the adoption of the Dingley tariff law and receiving a reasonable price for their output. The most of the lumber from my district is put upon the market at Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Buffalo. If this bill passes and the Dominion of Canada is allowed to ship her lumber into our markets free of duty it will be impossible for the lumbermen of my district to pay the freight upon their lumber to the markets above mentioned, which are 600 to 900 miles distant, and sell it in competition with lumber from Canada rafted across the river and down the rivers to our markets.

Then, again, Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist. I believe in protecting our own markets for our own people. Charity should begin at home, and for that reason I am utterly opposed to the passage of this bill.

We have another industry in my country—the mica industry. We have a number of mica mines throughout western North Carolina that are being worked at a fair profit to the owners of the mines. Whenever mica is placed on the free list it is bound to close down every mica mine in all this section, and

the capital invested will be virtually confiscated, and the wage earners who are operating those mines will be thrown out of employment.

Mr. Chairman, the reverses that we sustained in the last election did not come from the rural districts as a rule, but from the towns and cities; from men who are not producers but consumers; men who want to buy the products of the farm and the dairy and the forest as cheap as they can, losing sight of the real principles of protection. Protection is national in its scope, though the schedules apply locally, and we protectionists believe in protecting every interest of every section. Some of our friends claim that the tariff should be taken out of politics. That is impossible, for it will be an issue until Gabriel blows his trumpet, for there will be free traders and protectionists as long as the world stands.

The idea of revising the tariff schedule by schedule, in my judgment, will be a failure. A tariff in order to be fair and equitable must be comprehensive in its scope; it must be made for the entire country and not for a few favored sections. That is the real principle of the doctrine of protection. But if the method of revision schedule by schedule should be attempted, each section would want protection for its own products and not for the products of other sections, and thus selfishness and sectionalism would tend to destroy the benefits of the great fundamental policy of the Republican Party. The Keystone State of Pennsylvania is the greatest steel-producing State in the Union. Now, when our friends on the opposite side of the House undertake to revise the steel schedule I take it for granted that every Member from the State of Pennsylvania, regardless of politics, will vote for a duty on steel and the products of steel. The Members from other sections that are not producers of steel, unless they get protection on their products in return, will vote to put steel upon the free list, and so be it.

Then, again, when they take up the woolen schedule, I take it that every Member from the wool-producing districts will vote for a duty on wool and woolen goods. The Members from other sections of the country, if they do not get protection on their products in return, will, I take it, vote to put wool and woolen goods upon the free list.

When they take up the cotton schedule, which is a very important schedule for the Southland, I take it that all the Members from the cotton-mill districts of the South will vote for a duty upon cotton yarn and cotton fabrics. Then, if the State of Pennsylvania and the wool-producing sections do not get protection on their products in return, I take it that their Representatives will vote to put cotton yarn and fabrics on the free list.

So with lumber. I take it that when they take up the lumber schedule every Member representing a lumber district will vote for a duty upon lumber, and the Members from the cities and prairie States, if they get nothing in return, will vote to put lumber on the free list.

So with the grain-growing States of the West. When the grain schedule is taken up, I take it that every Member representing a grain-growing district will vote for a duty on grain, of whatever description it may be. The Members from the other sections of the country, if they do not get anything in return, will naturally vote to put grain on the free list. And so it will be with the districts producing live stock, and so forth.

Now, this policy will eventually lead to exactly what the Democratic Party has always been contending for—a tariff for revenue only or free trade, which virtually destroys the fundamental principles of protection. And whenever this thing happens, mark my prediction, it will be a sad day for the country as a whole.

For my part, I would rather go down in defeat standing on the deck of the old ship Protection, reading in the pages of history the grand achievements of the past wrought by the Republican Party, than to be elected on some new-fangled and untried issue, not knowing what results would follow.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 31856. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 31925. An act authorizing the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals;

H. R. 31166. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to exchange a certain right of way; and

H. R. 31066. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to purchase certain lands for lighthouse purposes.

H. R. 31923. An act permitting the building of a dam across Rock River near Byron, Ill.;

H. R. 27069. An act to relinquish the title of the United States in New Madrid location and survey No. 2828; and

H. R. 21965. An act for the relief of Mary Wind French.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 25 minutes.

Mr. McCALL. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 32216 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 32216, and pending that, I move that general debate be closed in one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 32216, pending which motion he moves that all general debate be limited to one-half hour.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAINES) there were 70 ayes and 127 noes.

So the motion was lost.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman from Massachusetts will not insist on his motion to close debate in half an hour. This is a very important question, and there are no end of gentlemen on the floor of this House who are clamoring for time to speak; some of them want considerable time, but most of them are willing to take a small allowance of time. They want to get an opportunity to express themselves. It does seem to me that we ought not to close a great question of this kind by cutting off debate. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his motion.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, the House has already had over 10 hours of general debate, which is a good deal of time, considering the stage of the session. I have been very desirous of accommodating everyone. On the other hand, many gentlemen have been pressing to have the bill out of the way. Now, if there could be some agreement reached whereby to-morrow can be devoted to this bill, I shall be willing to suspend. If it would be in order to make the motion that the House at 7 o'clock take a recess until to-morrow morning at half past 10, I would make that motion and withhold this motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can only make that motion by unanimous consent. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This unquestionably is a very important bill, and some Members wish to have a little more time for general debate. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts not think that this bill is of sufficient importance and so highly important a political matter from the standpoint of the Republicans that a rule should be brought in providing for its consideration?

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been asking for a rule from the very outset and have not succeeded in getting it, and I have been compelled to advance and feel my way along from minute to minute.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a privileged bill. It needs no rule for its consideration. The gentleman in charge of the bill has such a majority of votes in this House that he ought to be able to do anything he wants to do with or without a rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Payne bill was a privileged bill, and there was nothing else pending in Congress at the time, and yet the gentleman brought in a rule.

Mr. DALZELL. The Payne bill had under consideration unending tariff items.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the large majority of the House have wanted a rule, but the Committee on Rules has not given it.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman submits a motion for a recess?

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I will make the motion that at 15 minutes before 7 o'clock the House take a recess until 10.30 tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his other motion temporarily?

Mr. McCALL. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. Would the effect of that motion cancel the calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. No; it would not. It is entirely within the power of the House to do what it pleases.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the regular order.

Mr. McCALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on that state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 32216, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and pending that motion I move that general debate be closed in 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill, and pending that motion he makes another motion that the House conclude the general debate upon when it shall go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in 35 minutes. The question will first be taken on limiting debate to 35 minutes.

The question was taken and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 132, noes 91.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill H. R. 32216, with Mr. MANN in the chair.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy the time of the House but very few minutes. There are a few things that I thought were proper to inquire about. In my term of 14 years of service I have never known any important measure presented to this House concerning which less information was given to the Members than upon this measure. I do not know who prepared the form of the bill or the terms of it, except that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], whose name appears on the bill, declared that he is the putative father of it. Nobody has told either the Committee on Ways and Means or the House who the parties to this agreement are. The gentleman from Connecticut speaks about the duty of being neighborly to a people who speak the same language and have the same customs and adjoin our territory, but this must be an agreement between sovereigns. Where is the sovereignty in Canada? The constitution of Canada is an act of Parliament, and it can be repealed at any time. The Parliament of Canada can pass no legislation that can not be revised in the Parliament of the Imperial Government.

Even this agreement when it is made is subject to the approval or veto of the King and the Privy Council. Who are the parties to this agreement? Who are we dealing with? What benefit would we get from it, if the Imperial Government at any time chooses to change the preferential which she requires of her colony there? Since it has been under discussion in England the premier has said that he hoped that the Canadian Parliament would delay consideration of it until the Imperial Government would determine what preferentials should be fixed for her dependencies and her colonies, including Canada. I will not now enter into a discussion of what might be gained or lost by the admission of foreign products in competition with our own. What is Canada giving to us for the opportunity to sell in American markets? The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] was full of statistics and figures, and eloquent about it, giving us a new definition of a protective tariff, but for 48

years west of the Ohio River we have been standing by his belief and his testimony concerning the benefit of a protective tariff, maintaining the manufacturing system of New England, and cheerfully paying the cost of it in order that we may have a home market for the things which go from our farms. Just when did he learn that it would be better to get them from Canada? He did not tell us, except in one sentence, and that is that "the center of manufacturing is now in the State of Indiana." That is why it is necessary for the gentleman from Connecticut to be asking for free trade with Canada and why he is willing for free trade with any other country where the difference in the cost of production equals the cost of production here. This is a new interpretation of a protective tariff. When did any party in this country ever define a protective tariff to be a tariff justified only by the difference in the cost of production here and elsewhere?

Now, what the gentleman from Connecticut and some others are calling for and are willing to do is to wipe it all out the moment that the cost of production abroad agrees with the cost of production here. Why, in the British Columbia government the governor of the Province has absolute power over the export duty, and any day he may suspend the export duty upon logs and dump them down into Puget Sound and into the American market free from the export tax until they have unloaded their logs, and then he may revoke the suspension and the export law goes into effect again. Does the gentleman intend, by this reciprocity agreement proposition, to relieve us from that situation, or would he have the power to do it? The power to levy an export tax upon logs from Crown lands belongs to each Province of Canada, and not even the Canadian Parliament can revoke or suspend it. Nobody can touch it but the King and Privy Council and the Parliament of England. Who are we dealing with in making this treaty? The President sends a message and gives us an agreement, citing Schedule A and Schedule B. How many Members of this House know that Schedule A of this treaty is compiled of items from five schedules of the existing tariff law of the United States? Why was it necessary to select items from five different schedules of the tariff law and put them into this agreement and call it Schedule A, and does the House suppose it is legislating upon Schedule A of its tariff law? Is this tariff legislation sent here for us to act upon in ignorance of what we are doing? Must we act without inquiry? Is this scientific revision? From the time of the first government of nations it has been said in every great nation, "Let no great thing be done in haste. When you do not know what to do, do not do it." Now, why should you do a thing when you do not know whether it is right or wrong, but do it simply because there is a popular clamor somewhere in the air that seems to presage a political victory to somebody or to some party? I have not inquired what the farmers in Kansas think about it. I know, without being told, that when Canadian wheat can come in here and their railroads can give preferentials in rates and deliver it in Milwaukee or in the mills in Wisconsin, I know that same day the price of wheat goes down 10 cents a bushel from the northern line of Iowa to Oklahoma.

I do not need to be told that a reduction in every farm product will occur the day that this treaty goes into effect, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] proves it by saying that "it is the surplus which we have for sale that fixes the price." This time it is not to be the surplus of the United States which is to fix the price, but the surplus of Canada thrown into our markets which is to fix the price. [Applause.] And we are to vote for that and call it Republicanism! Is that to be Americanism, and am I to vote for it and go home and face the people who have honored me with unlimited confidence for 14 years, while I have been telling them that there could be no reciprocal agreement made with Canada that would not give England and the Imperial Government the preferential in her markets to our disadvantage? Go home and tell them that we have made a reciprocal agreement with a little people? What is her population? It is seven and one-half millions, backed by the greatest commercial empire that civilization has known, and with sovereign control over that agreement, when it is made, to expand it or contract it by the expansion and contraction of the preferential which the Imperial Government requires of Canada. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to

the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great regret to me that I find myself differing with so many of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, and it is a misfortune that in the consideration of a very important bill like this the House is deprived of the presence of its leader, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and at so critical a time it is denied the guidance of his parliamentary talent. In the wish that he may speedily be restored to health, I know that you will all join.

I shall not take much of the time of the House in describing the scope of this agreement. I would only call attention to the fact that the bill has been made the subject of much vague and general criticism, but that our attention has not been directed to a specific flaw in its structure. It was prepared chiefly in the Department of State, presided over by one of the greatest lawyers in America, and it exactly and completely carries out the purpose of the agreement upon every subject upon which the two Governments agreed with each other.

Gentlemen complain that they are in ignorance. I doubt it, Mr. Chairman. I imagine their ignorance is of such a nature that they would cease to cry for light if the 4th of March were here, the day on which this Congress ends by operation of law. I do not believe there is any Member of this House who does not fully and clearly understand the terms of the bill.

It includes three schedules. First, there is a schedule of articles upon which, in accordance with the agreement with the Canadian Government, there is an identical rate of duty provided in the two countries; second, there is a schedule enumerating articles all of which are placed upon the free list by both countries; and, third, there is another schedule in which the Government of one country agrees that certain duties upon certain articles may be remitted and the Government of the other country agrees that other duties, perhaps upon the same articles, or upon other articles, may be remitted. But there is not an equality of duties in the latter schedule.

That is the general scope of the agreement. The question is raised here whether the bill is amendable in the House.

It clearly is amendable. It is fully within the power of this House to change every one of the items and provisions of the bill, but by doing so it would depart from the terms of the agreement. I happen to have here the careful speech made by the Canadian minister of finance in presenting this matter to the Canadian Parliament. It is a long speech, and in explaining the provisions of the bill he was interrupted by a member, who asked:

Does that mean that all or none must be accepted on behalf of each Government?

Mr. FIELDING. Practically, I would say yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Is it an indivisible agreement?

Mr. FIELDING. I would think so, except this, that if we should attempt to make changes our American friends would be equally ready to make changes, and I am afraid that there would be danger of our not making any agreement at all. In that sense, I would say yes; it would be all or none, although Parliament, of course, would have the absolute right to make any changes it saw fit.

As I have just observed, Congress has that power as well as the Dominion Parliament.

And then, in reply to a further question, Mr. Fielding said, when asked if it would be subject to modification or the reopening of negotiations:

It might be possible; but I am bound to say that I think the time is exceedingly favorable for the accomplishment of this purpose, if we agree that it is desirable, and if any attempt were made to delay it by further negotiations I am afraid it would put in peril the whole arrangement.

Now, there is the view of the Canadian minister of finance, which, as I am credibly informed, is in entire accord with the view of the representatives of our own Government. I think Members will see the difference in the effect of an amendment upon this bill and an ordinary bill. It is very easy for gentlemen opposed to the bill to vote against it, but they can accomplish the defeat of the object it has in view as easily and as effectively in another way. They can vote seriously to amend it.

And not merely that, Mr. Chairman, but we shall encounter another difficulty by making some of the amendments suggested to the bill. The thing that has been discussed before the American people during the last year, perhaps more seriously than any other, is the evil of having a general revision of all the schedules of the tariff in one bill and thus bringing all these great interests here to Washington and leading them to combine and seize Congress by the throat.

These innocent and affecting amendments proposed purely in the interest of the destruction of the bill, but ostensibly

directed with a show of virtue against one trust or another trust, would have the effect, if we should accept them, of assembling here a phalanx of banded and federated interests and put in the pathway of this bill on its way through the Senate an array of hundred-handed giants, and it would be nearly certain that their alliance with the natural enemies of the bill would accomplish its defeat. Now, if gentlemen want to vote against the bill, let them vote frankly against it and strike out the enacting clause, but let them not rest under the delusion that they are acting in favor of the bill when they yield to the temptation to make a fine technical record against the trusts and by so doing bring about the defeat of the bill.

The question has been asked, Why was not beef put upon the free list? As to that, presumably, the President of the United States made the best trade he was able to make. The Canadian rate on beef now is 3 cents a pound, and on beef coming to this country $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. It was agreed that there should be reciprocally the uniform rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. Presumably Canada, with her packing industry, did not desire to remove her duty entirely. Gentlemen who now ardently desire to smash our Beef Trust should know that with beef reciprocally free our great packing industry would crush all competition across the line and add Canada to its empire. Therefore Canada would very reasonably desire to have some duty, and the agreement fixed it at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound.

I might make reference in the same way to the other items of the bill and find in each case a reason why the negotiators agreed upon this duty. Gentlemen have made the objection that we are only getting a small market, that we are exchanging a market of 92,000,000 people for a market of 7,500,000 people. But they forget that we shall all enjoy that common market. They might as well use the argument that because the State of New York has only 9,000,000 people, while the rest of the country has 83,000,000 people, it would be a piece of wisdom for the 83,000,000 to get rid of the State of New York. It requires little discernment to see that when you add a small market to a great one the result is a still greater market for the common enjoyment of all. Thus the operation of this bill will, to the extent that it gives the two countries a larger market, confer a benefit upon both.

Then objection has been made that legislation based upon this agreement violates the most-favored-nation clause of treaties, and gentlemen are complaining that they have not been enlightened upon that point. We all know that we have had a treaty with Cuba for eight years giving that island preferential rates, and yet the point has never been made against it by any other nation.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCALL. I am sorry I can not; I beg the gentleman's pardon, but he had an hour, and I have only reserved 25 minutes for myself.

Gentlemen who make the objection evidently have not looked at the precedents. I have been furnished here with a memorandum by the State Department, which shows that preferential rates similar in character to these are made by Russia, the German Empire, Persia, France, and perhaps a dozen other nations. The Government of the United States has always insisted, when it gives a tariff concession in exchange for a special consideration, that that concession does not extend to other nations which do not give that special consideration. That is entirely clear, and gentlemen need not be misled upon that point.

A great deal has been said here about the terrible calamity this bill is going to bring upon agriculture in the United States. I speak with some hesitation upon that point, and with deference to the views and opinions of gentlemen who represent the agricultural regions of the country. But when I scan the commerce of Canada and the United States; when I see, for instance, that of butter the United States sends to Canada more than twice as much, notwithstanding the existing tariffs, as Canada sends to the United States; when I see that we send over fifteen times as many eggs to Canada as Canada sends to the United States; that we send nearly as much wheat to Canada, notwithstanding our great mills, as Canada sends to the United States, I can see no threat to the agricultural interests of this country. I attempted to show in the report of the committee, which I prepared, something that I believe is susceptible of conclusive demonstration, and that is that so long as both countries produce a surplus of wheat, which they export to the open market, Canadian wheat and American wheat will sell on a parity, having reference to the cost of transportation to the world's markets. For a third of the year the price of wheat at Winnipeg is higher than the price of wheat on this side of the line.

It is fixed with reference to Liverpool. It will be fixed with reference to Liverpool so long as we have an exportable surplus. When the time of our scarcity comes, when we shall consume more wheat than we produce and a tariff would become a factor in fixing the price, is it sound policy, would it be humane, for us in the time of our scarcity to increase the price of wheat by levying a tariff duty upon it, or to increase the world's price of wheat by levying a tariff duty upon it?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCALL. I regret to say that the time at my disposal is so limited—

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. McCALL. In view of the limited time remaining, although I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman, I must decline to yield.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to set the gentleman right.

Mr. McCALL. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be protected, because we obviously can not both occupy the floor—

Mr. STEENERSON. I simply want to correct the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts declines to yield.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, my statement about the price in Canada and this country is based upon the average for three years in Winnipeg and Minneapolis. It is argued against the bill that Canada can still give a preferential tariff to Great Britain, and that there should be some provision contained in it that she shall not prefer the products of Great Britain to those of the United States. Well, it happens that Canada is a part of the British Empire. She is as much under that sovereignty as the State of Illinois or the State of New York is under our sovereignty, and, to say the least, it would scarcely be in good form or a marked exhibition of international courtesy for us, in passing this bill, to try to regulate in advance the internal fiscal policy of the British Empire.

However, it will always be within the power of Congress, if it shall appear that any undue advantage is hereafter given Great Britain, to correct and change these rates at any time or to repeal them all. The British Empire has for very many years pursued a policy of great liberality toward her colonies. She gives them practical autonomy. We think of her not so much as a world-wide empire, but rather as a cluster of free nations; and it seems to me it would not be an act of propriety for us to attempt to inject into this bill any provision that would seek to regulate the relations of Canada to the Empire of which she is a part or to impose any limitations upon them.

Mr. Chairman, fear is nearly as much of a motive or agency in directing the actions of men as hope. I do not mean to reflect upon any gentleman in this House, but I can easily see how an arrangement might be made between two countries located as we are, an arrangement beneficial to both, which, because of its novelty, would excite the alarm of the conservatives of both nations.

Canada is not unanimously for this agreement. Only 15 less than a majority in her House of Commons, as I understand it, were against it on a test vote. Some of the farmers of Canada are alarmed, and upon our side of the line an attempt is being made to frighten our own farmers and cause them to believe that this bill means ruin to their interests; but they have only to look at the broad aspects of the case, at the great value and benefit that it may be to both countries, to have their fears entirely dispelled. Why, if it were proposed to add to this country to-day another Louisiana purchase, if it were proposed to add two or three agricultural States, who would there be to deny that such a circumstance would augment materially the prosperity and wealth of the two countries? And yet, to the extent to which this bill goes, that is just what we are doing.

One has but to look at the map to have the case conclusively shown. The common frontier between the two countries is 3,700 miles long.

Maine cuts deeply into the maritime provinces; the Province of Ontario dips to the south almost into the vitals of the Republic, and then, as if to make more clear the purpose of nature to interdict the building of a commercial wall between the two peoples, beyond the Great Lakes and to the Pacific Ocean runs an imaginary line that crosses broad valleys, navigable rivers, and lofty mountain ranges that go north and south. The commerce would naturally move parallel to the rivers and valleys and mountains from one country into the other. Our artificial commercial boundary requires Canada, hemmed in as

she is by the cold on the one side and by our northern frontier on the other, to struggle against all these natural obstacles, and to send her commerce for 3,000 miles to the east when that commerce would naturally fall into our own country. The object of commercial union was clearly stated by Goldwin Smith to be "to bring Canada within the commercial pale of her own continent and thereby put an end to the commercial atrophy which her isolation entails. A reciprocal benefit would of course be afforded to the United States in an increase of commercial area and opportunities of opening up new sources of wealth."

Suppose we get 10,000,000 or even 50,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat each year. So long as we have a surplus for export, for every bushel of wheat that comes in from Winnipeg another bushel will go out at New York or some other seaport.

The mills of Minneapolis will have their business greatly increased. The clearings of the financial transactions will take place here. Much of the purchase price will go into the ordinary channels of our trade, and the quickening influence will be felt throughout our entire country.

Mr. Chairman, there are important features of this bill which lack of time will not permit me to discuss. My colleague, who represents with so much fidelity and ability what he believes to be the interests of his constituents, is opposed to the fishing clauses in the bill. Why, Mr. Chairman, the fisheries have existed in the city of Gloucester since 1624. They existed and flourished there long before ever our tariffs were invented. The fisheries of America kindled the imagination of Edmund Burke to one of his most magnificent eulogies. He said that while we were looking for our fishermen among the tumbling mountains of ice and beneath the Arctic circle, we would hear that they had pierced the opposite region of polar cold and were at the antipodes, and that the hardy enterprise of these men excelled that of the men of Holland, of France, and England. And these recent people, he said, were yet in their gristle and had not hardened into the bone of manhood. What Burke said of the whale fisheries could be said in effect of our other deep-sea fisheries as well. They have not only survived free trade in fish but they have flourished under it, and they are now languishing under protection.

I doubt whether the present unprosperous condition of the industry is to continue. It appears already to be in a decline, for the rewards are out of proportion to the perils and hardships of the calling.

Mr. Chairman, the attitude of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber is a subject of a good deal of concern to some of our friends on this side. "The Democratic Members are for this measure, and, therefore, the Republican Members should be against it." I think, unless some sounder reason than that is shown for opposing a piece of pure and disinterested statesmanship on the part of the President, that gentlemen who may be influenced by it may regret their action. I do not mean that they will regret it in the narrow and personal sense that men feel in any reverse to their own political fortunes, but that they will have that keener and nobler regret that one feels when he has stood in the pathway of an enlightened policy and has prevented a great benefit from coming to his countrymen and to mankind.

I am making no apology for the Democratic Members, but whatever their mistakes may have been in the past, whatever political crimes they may have committed, I trust Members on this side will understand that in this instance they have their faces turned toward the rising sun. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman I hope this bill will pass as it was reported, and pass by a decisive majority. I believe that the President of the United States has risen above the narrow interests of localities and that he has comprehended the whole country, that he has not been swayed by the clamor of special interests, but that he has had the wisdom and the courage to negotiate an agreement in the interest of the masses of the people, and I trust that this House will rally behind him and share with him in the glory of having secured the establishment of a policy of enlightened statesmanship, of high patriotism, and of single-minded justice. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts) there were 145 ayes and 79 noes.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 32216 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Rules to report a substitute to House resolution 972 (H. Res. 974).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 32216) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes; that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the pending amendments and on the bill to its final passage, and the vote upon the pending amendments and final passage of the bill shall be immediately taken without intervening motion, excepting a motion to recommit.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Upon this resolution the gentleman from Illinois demands the previous question. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 131, noes 74.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to debate the resolution under the 40-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Democratic Party in voting for the previous question on this rule, this gag rule, under the ostensible pretense of shutting off debate, is an abandonment— [Applause and cheers on Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will suspend. The gentleman is entitled to 20 minutes, and the House will be in order. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. After all your professions in the last few years, after all your professions in the late campaign as to what you would do for freedom of debate and amendment, after the words of your Speaker-to-be that as long as he stayed in this House he should stand for the right of amendment of every great bill, now you are prepared to eat, to swallow every word you have uttered. [Applause.] I make this prophecy, gentleman, that this is only the beginning of what you will do when you get control of this House. [Applause.] Every word that you have uttered in the past is now under suspicion. I place no credence in the professions which you uttered so glibly on the 15th of March, 1909, when you split your party open in order to prevent the adoption of liberal rules in this House. I call you 23 gentlemen to witness, you 23 who voted for the Fitzgerald resolution, which enabled this House to proceed on its old system of rules. I ask whether your associates have not to-day justified your course, for the whole Democratic Party has joined you. [Applause.]

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter a protest against the cloture of debate and the placing of this measure on its final passage at this time. The passage of a measure of so great and grave importance with such hasty and immature consideration is hardly in keeping with the deliberation that should characterize a branch of the highest legislative department of our Government.

To the gentlemen across the aisle I will say that if their present attitude is a forecast of the fulfillment of their pretensions in respect to freedom of debate and amendment when they come into control, it is not difficult to foresee the result when their case is again submitted to the people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In a matter so important, so comprehensive, and so far-reaching the members of this House are entitled to proper time within which to study and investigate the questions involved, and ought to have the right to expect that the committee reporting it would submit both the reasons and the information upon which it acted.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES], a member of the committee, certainly drew a severe indictment against the manner in which the measure was considered by the committee.

As the undisputed record now stands, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], who, it is admitted, is not its author; that the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means did not reach the merits of the subject; that no one representing the State Department or those who negotiated the proposed agreement appeared before the committee to explain its provisions or submit the information and the reasons which induced our Government to concur in it. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES] further states, without contradiction, that the State Department was requested to appear before the committee and either failed or refused to do so.

We have expended several hundred thousand dollars for the Tariff Board whose investigations in Canada have included at least one important item involved in the proposed agreement, and yet it appears that not even this information was sought. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia when he suggests that we have proceeded with "indecent haste."

If it had been left to the Republican members of the committee the bill would not have been reported, and from the vote in the House on preliminary matters it is already clear that the majority of the Republican Members are not in favor of it.

The immediate question before us is whether the bill must be passed in toto and without amendments. It is urged that if any amendments are made it will defeat the measure; that it would result in its resubmission to further negotiations. This position is true in so far as Canadian duties are concerned, but is not true and can not, in the very nature of the case, be true as to our duties. It can not be questioned but that we could change every American duty on Canadian imports, so far as further reductions or an extension of the free list is concerned, without the consent of Canada, just the same as Canada could make further reductions or extend her free list on imports from the United States without our concurrence therein. Even if we should desire to amend along lines that would require the concurrence of Canada, we should have the right to do so, and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARNER] has pointed out so ably and clearly, there is a precedent for so doing in the action of the French Senate a few years ago in amending the treaty or agreement submitted between Canada and France.

The impression has been given out and seems to prevail that unless Congress immediately accepts the proposed agreement, precisely as it is submitted, all hope of reciprocal relations with Canada must be abandoned, and that therefore Congress, in the closing days of a short session when it is so congested with business that grave doubt exists as to its ability to pass the necessary appropriation bills for the maintenance of the Government, must, without pausing to consider, pass this important legislation.

From 1854 to 1866 we had a reciprocal treaty with Canada which Mr. Fielding recently stated was the same as the proposed agreement, "with comparatively little change." That agreement was abrogated by the United States, and, while I do not desire to discuss it at this time, it was the general consensus of opinion at that time that its effect was not beneficial to the United States.

From the time of its abrogation to the present time Canada has persistently and, I might add, almost continuously sought a renewal of the reciprocal relations. Canada has repeatedly sent commissioners to the United States for the purpose of conducting negotiations to that end. Not only this, but in a number, if not all, of the tariff bills that Canada has passed, a standing offer has been made for reciprocal relations with the United States, particularly as to farm products. I will quote from the Canadian tariff of 1879, and other tariffs contain substantially the same provision. Section 6 is as follows:

Any or all of the following articles—that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted, or smoked), and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon proclamation of the governor in council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

It will be seen from the foregoing that Canada was then willing, as she has at other times been willing, to concede either a reduction in duty or the extension of the free list so as to include some, at least, of the secondary products of the farm. It will also be noted that the foregoing proposition includes both coal and coke. But I do not desire to discuss that matter at this time. I am calling attention to it now only for the purpose of showing, as Mr. Fielding stated in his report to the House of Commons, that Canada has, since the abrogation of the treaty in 1866, uniformly desired to renew reciprocal relations with the United States with a view of obtaining access to our markets, and I venture to affirm that there has never been a time since the abrogation of the former treaty when the United States could not have made as good an agreement as the one proposed.

In view of undisputed history it can hardly be urged now that if Congress should not concur in all the specific details of the proposed agreement, or should make amendments thereto requiring the concurrence of Canada, that Canada would decline to continue the negotiations. It certainly is not extrava-

gant to affirm that Canada, with her 7,000,000 of people, is just as anxious to get into the United States markets, with our 90,000,000 of people, as the United States is to get into Canadian markets. I submit, therefore, that we are not justified in proceeding with such undue haste.

I shall not attempt at this time to enter into any extended discussion of the subject, but shall confine myself to a few general observations on the concrete proposition before us. It is called a reciprocity agreement. The name used implies that there is something reciprocal about it. I have searched in vain to discover its reciprocal features. Certainly no one who has thus far taken the floor in its support has attempted to point out wherein it is reciprocal; that is to say, what the United States receives for what it gives. I care nothing for the name given to the agreement; the substance only is material. All trade agreements imply an exchange of equivalents. That is their purpose.

Canada has long desired to obtain access to our markets for her agricultural products. The reason is plain. Our markets are the most accessible and profitable. Canada has been working to this end for half a century. No one can study the schedules or read the statement made by Mr. Fielding to the House of Commons without reaching the conclusion that access to our markets for her farm products was the controlling consideration on the part of Canada. That Canada has accomplished this purpose under the proposed agreement is clear, and has done it in such a way, as Mr. Fielding further observes, as "not to do any injustice to her manufacturers." On the contrary, we have given Canada free access to our markets for her agricultural products, and at the same time, so far as I am able to analyze the schedules, have gained no substantial advantage for our manufacturers. If the law of contracts was applicable, it could fairly be said that the agreement was voidable for failure of consideration from our point of view.

The express purpose of the agreement, as I read the President's message and understand the remarks of the gentlemen who have thus far spoken, is to reduce the cost of living. If it accomplishes this purpose, it can do so only through reduced prices to the American farmer for his products, which, I assume from their position, is expected to result.

There are others who favor the measure who affirm that it will have no effect on the price of farm products, but if this be true then its declared purpose would fail.

It seems to me that the opening of our markets to Canadian products will affect the price of farm products in this country. It has been stated by gentlemen who are in a position to know the facts that there is a difference between the price of farm products in Canada and in the United States, and if this is true then the removal of our duties would be followed by a lowering of our prices.

Within recent years Canada has been actively exploiting her agricultural resources. The productive power of her soil has been demonstrated. She has a vast area of fertile land still untouched. Her cheap lands are a standing invitation and inducement to American farmers to move there. The States of the Middle West have reason to know this from their experience of the past few years. If the Canadian farmer is to be given the same access to our markets as the American farmer, this movement will receive a strong impetus, and the natural effect would seem to follow of materially increasing the value of Canadian land and retarding, if it does not decrease, the value of our lands. The tendency at least would be toward equalization of values. Mr. White, Canada's emigration agent in the United States, stated a few days ago in Ottawa that the emigration from the United States into Canada this year would approximate 150,000, and that the expectation that this agreement would be adopted had already increased the price of wheat land at least \$5 an acre.

In many of the speeches that have been made, both in the House and elsewhere by the advocates of the measure, special reference is made to corn. It is true that our country produces a large percentage of the world's production of corn. It is also true that the corn crop of Canada is negligible. And it is held out that Canada needs our corn, and that her market is of advantage to us, and the inference is left that this will be effectuated through the proposed agreement. That this impression prevails there can be no doubt. I have received letters from my State urging this as one of the arguments in favor of the agreement, and I have read editorials in the newspapers citing this fact as one of the advantages that will accrue to the Iowa farmer and those living in the corn belt.

Those who make this statement should also be candid enough to state that corn is now, and has been for years, on the Canadian free list.

It is held out that Canada's production of farm products is not important. I hold in my hand the Canadian Yearbook for 1909, which shows on page 62 that Canada's exports of agricultural products for that year amounted to approximately \$72,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 was to the United States, and that in the same year Canada's export of animals amounted to \$53,000,000, of which \$7,000,000 was to the United States. I am giving the figures in round numbers. If the remaining \$68,000,000 of Canada's exports of agricultural products and the remaining \$46,000,000 export of animals were thrown into this country in competition with our products on a free-trade basis it would seem as though it would affect our prices if the law of supply and demand still obtains.

For the purpose of showing the rapid increase in Canadian production as compared with our production in agricultural products I will insert the statistics showing the production in Canada of certain products in 1901 and 1909 and of the same products in the United States for those years:

	Canada.		United States.	
	1901	1909	1901	1909
Wheat.....bushels..	55,572,368	166,744,000	748,460,218	737,189,000
Oats.....do.....	151,497,407	355,398,000	736,896,724	1,007,353,000
Barley.....do.....	22,224,366	55,398,000	109,932,924	170,284,000
Buckwheat.....do.....	4,547,159	7,806,000	15,125,939	17,428,000
Hay.....tons.....	7,852,731	11,877,100	50,591,000	64,938,000
Potatoes.....bushels..	55,362,635	99,087,200	187,598,000	376,537,000

It will be seen that Canada in 1909 produced between one-fourth and one-fifth as much wheat, nearly one-third as much barley, more than one-third as many oats, between one-third and one-fourth as many potatoes, nearly one-half as much buckwheat, and other products in proportion. I do not have the comparative figures as to other articles, but in many other lines of agricultural products Canada has also experienced a rapid development.

It will also be noticed from the foregoing that there has been no increase in the production of wheat in the United States between 1901 and 1909, while in Canada there has been an increase of 200 per cent; that the increase of barley production in this country was 55 per cent and in Canada 150 per cent; that the increase in the production of oats in this country was 37 per cent and in Canada 135 per cent; the increase in buckwheat in this country was 15 per cent and in Canada 75 per cent; the increase in hay in this country was 28 per cent, in Canada 50 per cent, while the increase in the production of potatoes is practically the same. I am stating the approximate percentages.

These figures are significant and especially so when you take into consideration that Canada has approximately only 8 per cent of the population of the United States. Her surplus is increasing each year, for her agricultural development is increasing with much greater rapidity than her population. Her exports in agricultural products have increased from \$24,781,486 in 1901 to \$71,997,207 in 1909.

If the increase in Canadian production in the past eight years continues, as it surely will, it will not be many years until Canada will equal the United States in production, with the exception, of course, of corn.

I can not consider at this time the question as to the difference in the cost of production of farm products in the two countries. It is urged that there is no difference; that the cost of farm labor is as high in Canada as in this country. As to that I do not know, but this fact is true, there is a marked difference in farm values which in itself would make a difference in the cost of production. There are various other elements which enter into it, and besides, our farmers are contributing to the support of our Government and institutions. But further than this general reference I do not have the time to discuss the question now.

I have directed attention to these facts for the dual purpose of showing, first, the probable effect the proposed agreement will have on the price of our farm products, and, second, the importance and, I might add, necessity of Canada gaining access to our markets.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in Iowa and have lived there all my life. Iowa is an agricultural State; we are in the heart of the corn belt; our fertility of soil is unexcelled; our climate is suitable for agriculture; every environment is conducive to rural life. Our farmers are intelligent, industrious, and thrifty. My early years were spent on a farm, and I have been closely associated with our farming interests all my life. I say to you in

all candor and earnestness that if you will take the average farmer with an average farm and take into consideration a fair rate of interest on his investment and a fair compensation for his time and service, the expense of operation and of repairs, that at the end of the year he does not have as a clear profit any more than he is fairly entitled to.

While the recent census has not been officially published, from the statements given out it appears that, in many States at least, there has been a falling off in our rural population; that our increase in population has been in the cities, and this tendency has engaged the thought of our people. Within recent years a commission was appointed by the Government to investigate the subject of rural life—how to make it more attractive and remunerative, how to keep the boys on the farm, how to keep our rural population from entering in the cities—and it is one of the important economic questions before our country to-day. The National Government is giving it consideration, and in many, at least, of the States, particularly those chiefly devoted to agriculture, the subject is receiving active consideration. All admit how vitally our rural population is related to our economic, social, and political life. To that great, strong, clear-headed class we instinctively turn as the bone and sinew of our Republic. They constitute no small proportion of our population and contribute no mean share to our general prosperity. Under the census of 1900, of the 29,000,000 persons over 10 years of age engaged in the gainful occupations over 10,000,000 were in agricultural pursuits. Of the \$28,000,000,000 estimated total product of the United States during the past year, over \$8,500,000,000 was estimated as farm products. In 1900 the total value of farm lands, including equipment and stock, was over \$20,000,000,000.

While I can not at this time enter into a general argument on the proposition before us, I have made these general references for the purpose of showing that we can not afford to pass hastily, and without the most careful consideration, legislation of such vital concern to this great class of producers.

I have spoken of the subject thus far from a purely non-partisan point of view, but, speaking as a Republican, it seems to me that this legislation is not in keeping with the protective policy of the Republican Party. It exempts from protection one great producing class. It means free trade for the farmer for everything he sells, while protection is retained on practically everything he buys. He sells his products in a free-trade market and buys his reaper or his plow or other machinery, or clothing, boots or shoes, in a protected market. It is discriminatory legislation.

When the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] was making his very earnest appeal in support of the measure upon what he called broad and general grounds and practically advocating free-trade relations between this country and Canada, I pointedly asked him the question as to whether he would consent to an extension of our free list so as to include the textile products, and he refused to yield. In order to do the gentleman no injustice and to quote exactly the colloquy which took place I will read from the record of yesterday's proceedings, as follows:

Mr. HILL. Why should we not supply each other's wants and meet each other's necessities without any of the restrictions which govern and control our relations with the people on the other side of the ocean, where like conditions do not prevail?

Mr. PICKETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. PICKETT. If the gentleman's argument is good about free interchange of trade with Canada, why, then, should it be limited to one class of producers and one class of products alone?

Mr. HILL. I am putting this whole matter on the basis of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and I will show before I get through that there is no difference in this case.

Mr. PICKETT. Then I assume—

Mr. HILL. I must decline—

Mr. PICKETT. Then I assume you are in favor of extending our free list to all manufactured products of Canada, especially to the textile industries.

Mr. HILL. I must decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut declines to yield further.

The reason the gentleman from Connecticut refused to yield is quite manifest. He stands for the policy of free trade as to everything his own people buy and protection for everything they produce. For years the Representatives of New England have appealed to the farmers of the country to support the protective policy with a view of building up a home market. If they abandon the policy of protection now by exempting the farmer from its application, they will appeal in vain to the farmer for protection to their industries. It is a very short-sighted policy.

If we are to take a broad view of this question, as the advocates of the proposed measure are urging, then I reply that we can not lose sight of the relationship of the prosperity of the

farmer on the one hand to the general prosperity of our country on the other. You can not disassociate them. I never ride through a farming country and look out upon the fields with their growing crops but I reflect on what would happen if nature refused to respond or the farmer abandoned his work. Their crops control the trade currents of the world. They are the masters of industry, commerce, and finance. If the prosperity of the farmer is affected it is felt in every avenue of our commercial and industrial life. Our prosperity must be mutual, and, speaking from the standpoint of a protective Republican, if we are to have free trade for the farmer let us extend it to other classes, for I believe with McKinley, who, speaking on this same issue, said:

When the country is ready for free trade let us have it in all things, without exception or restriction.

I now desire to refer briefly to the other phase of the subject, to wit, what are we receiving from Canada?

I shall only refer to the matter in so far as it affects agricultural implements. The reason I do so is twofold: First, there are many agricultural implement establishments in my district and, for that matter, in the Middle West. Iowa is rapidly developing along these lines. Many establishments heretofore doing business farther east have removed to Iowa. They see the wisdom of manufacturing nearer the market. While Iowa shows a slight reduction in population the falling off was entirely in the rural districts. The cities show an increase. And, second, because of the particular reference to the agricultural implement industry contained in the President's message, as follows:

The benefit to our widespread agricultural implement industry from a reduction of Canada duties in the agreement is clear. Similarly the new widely distributed and expanding motor-vehicle industry of the United States is given access into the Dominion market on advantageous terms.

It is asserted by those who favor the agreement that there is practically no difference in the cost of production in Canada and this country. This statement, however, is challenged by others. It can fairly be inferred that those who negotiated the treaty acted on the assumption at least that there was no substantial difference in the cost of production in Canada and this country.

If the question of cost of production was considered by our commissioners, then Congress ought to have the information on which they based their conclusions. I am free to admit that I have no such information before me as will enable me to reach a definite and independent judgment in the matter.

I have been informed by manufacturers of agricultural implements who are familiar with the manufacturing conditions in Canada that in eastern Canada the cost of production is less than in this country, while in western Canada, where labor is higher, the cost of production is about the same. I am speaking now solely with reference to the manufacture of agricultural implements.

I have heard of no claim being made that the cost of production is greater in Canada than in this country, and it would be fair to state that on the average the cost of production in Canada is below the cost of production in this country.

It has been my opinion that the cost of production in Canada is lower than in the United States but I have not had the time to make an investigation to confirm it. For the purposes of argument only, let it be conceded that there is no difference in the cost of production for, if we act on that assumption and the agreement discloses no advantage to our manufacturers, then it fails on the premise its own advocates have laid down.

Bearing this in mind, I now want to take up the agricultural implement schedule under the proposed agreement.

In the State of Iowa, as well as in the Middle States, there are large manufacturers of cream separators. They are already on the Canadian free list, and, furthermore, the Canadian market is protected, as I am informed, by her patent laws. We are also manufacturing in the Middle West portable and traction engines. There is no change in the Canadian duty on them. The same is true as to horsepowers for farm use. Manure spreaders, the manufacture of which has rapidly developed in the West during the past few years, is another article on which there is no change in Canadian duty. Then there is windmills and parts for repair. The Canadian duty on farm wagons has been reduced from 25 to 22½ per cent. The Canadian duty on hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed mills, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers has been reduced from 25 to 20 per cent. The duty on plows, harrows, seed drills, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and parts has been reduced from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, and the Canadian duty on harvesters, reapers, and mowers has been reduced from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent, and the Canadian duty on automobiles and motor vehicles from 35 per cent to 30 per cent.

Bearing in mind that it is conceded that the cost of production in this country is as much, if not more, than the cost of production in Canada, I am unable to see how our automobile and motor-vehicle industry is given access to Canadian markets on advantageous terms when they are met at the boundary line of Canada with the demand for 30 per cent ad valorem duty. And I am equally unable to understand how our manufacturers of agricultural implements, under the same conditions stated, are given any advantage even in the few instances where there has been a slight reduction in duty when they are required to pay to the customs officers of Canada before crossing the line a tariff duty of from 15 per cent to 22½ per cent ad valorem.

I am unable to reconcile the logic of the advocates of this measure. Conceding the facts to be as the advocates of the measure allege, it then follows that we have received no advantage. No arguments have yet been advanced and no facts have yet been presented which even tend to prove that there has been a fair exchange of equivalents between the two countries. If the slight reductions that have been made in the Canadian duty as to agricultural implements will be of any material advantage to our manufacturers in competition with Canadian manufacture, it certainly is not so understood by the commissioners who represented the Canadian Government. Mr. Fielding, one of the commissioners, in submitting his report to the House of Commons, observed that such reductions as were made on agricultural implements were "without doing any injustice to the industries of Canada." And in his cablegram to the home Government he further states:

The range of manufactures affected is comparatively small and in most cases the reductions are small.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Fielding was right.

A short time ago I received a letter from a gentleman in my home city who is both a large manufacturer and distributor of agricultural implements. He also owns and operates a Canadian farm of several thousand acres. He has a practical knowledge of business conditions in Canada. He is an earnest advocate of Canadian reciprocity, and in his first letter urged me to support "reciprocity with Canada." Replying, I inclosed him a copy of the message, directed his attention to the schedules attached, and asked him as a plain business proposition how it would benefit our manufacturers of agricultural implements and whether, in his judgment, it was a fair trade. I quote briefly from his reply:

I am a thorough believer in reciprocity providing both sides reciprocate, but it looks very much to me from the way they have it lined up that they (Canada) are getting the long end of it.

I have received several letters from manufacturers in Iowa asking me to support "Canadian reciprocity" on the ground that it would enlarge their market. In answering their letters, I sent them a copy of the message with the schedules attached, asked their careful examination of the schedules pertaining to their product, and, after doing so, to point out the advantage which they would receive under the proposed agreement. I have yet to receive a reply stating that the agreement is fair or that any advantage would accrue to our manufacturers of agricultural implements.

The general impression prevails that we are gaining free access to the Canadian market, and many have expressed a favorable opinion of the proposed agreement, acting on that assumption and without stopping to consider the schedules. In a marked copy of the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 10 that reached my desk this morning, evidently for the purpose of influencing my support of the measure, is a copy of the resolutions adopted by the National Cannery Association of this country, as follows:

The reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada now pending in Congress enlists the interest of every citizen of the United States. There is no branch of trade or of manufacture upon which the confirmation of this treaty can confer more lasting or far-reaching benefit than to the manufacturer of canned goods. The free interchange of the products of the canneries of both countries we believe will be welcomed as heartily by our neighbors across the border as by ourselves.

The association is undoubtedly composed of keen, shrewd, capable business leaders in the canning industry, and yet they commend the agreement because of the "free interchange of the products of the canneries of both countries," not stopping to ascertain the facts, for if they had they could easily have discovered that there is not a free interchange of canned products under the proposed agreement. The Canadian duty on canned vegetables under the agreement has only been reduced from 1½ cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound, and the Canadian duty on canned fruits has only been reduced from 2¼ cents per pound to 2 cents per pound; and the Canadian duty on canned meats and poultry reduced from 27½ per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem.

I simply cite this to show how the name "reciprocity" has led people to jump at the conclusion that the agreement is reciprocal in fact.

The Canadian commissioners are to be congratulated. They have certainly accomplished their object in the negotiations. The farmers of Canada have been given free access to our markets, but our manufacturers must still pay a duty ranging from 15 per cent up to 30 per cent for the privilege of doing business in Canadian markets. Our farmers will be lured in the future, as they have been in the past, to remove to Canada because of the cheapness of the lands and the added reason, under the proposed agreement, of accessibility to our markets; but our manufacturers can not follow them and sell them agricultural implements without paying a duty which Canada at least considers protective.

While the agricultural resources of Canada are developing, as they surely will if this agreement takes effect, her establishments engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements will grow and expand under the protection which Canada has retained for them.

There is one point—and to my mind a very material one—that has thus far not been referred to. Other gentlemen have referred to the possible complications that may arise between our country and other countries with whom we have existing treaties containing the so-called favored-nation clause. It has also been developed that Great Britain will still retain her preferential rate from Canada and that she will be given access to Canadian markets on the same class of goods at a lower rate than the rates to be given the United States under the proposed agreement. This is conceded. Whether complications will arise between the United States and other nations is disputed. The State Department, however, has thus far failed to submit any statement in reference thereto.

The point to which I refer, however, goes further than either of these. It is this: That Canada must give to every other nation with whom she has a treaty containing the favored-nation clause the same preference that she gives to the United States under the proposed agreement and without any equivalent in exchange therefor. This is in accordance with the construction that has been given to the favored-nation clause by nearly every European nation for the past hundred years, with very few exceptions.

I do not, however, submit this point on my own opinion, but I cite the opinion of Mr. Fielding, one of the commissioners who negotiated the tentative agreement on the part of Canada, who, in submitting his official report to the House of Commons in Canada on the 26th of January, when this precise question was put to him, stated as follows:

These regulations will apply to British goods as well, if they should be found in any case to affect them, but these cases will be found to be very few. They will apply, however, not only to the United States, but they will apply to every country with which we have what is called the favored-nation treaty. It is well understood that by virtue of these old treaties, many of them made years ago, at a time when Canada had hardly reached its present mature status, and when the colonies were not consulted, as they are now, in regard to these arrangements, these old treaties, still outstanding, binding the whole Empire, oblige us to give whatever is given to one country to all other countries possessing these treaties. We have had that question repeatedly up here, and so these deductions will have to be given in each case to the various countries which have what is called the favored-nation treaties.

I call particular attention to the concluding sentence of Mr. Fielding, where he says clearly and decisively:

And so these deductions will have to be given in each case to the various countries which have what is called the favored-nation treaty.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Has the gentleman noticed in the bill pending before the Canadian Parliament that that precise provision is in it?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly; it is in the bill, and I am glad the gentleman from South Dakota has called attention to it.

Mr. FASSETT. The same thing is possible with us under the favored-nation clause.

Mr. PICKETT. That is my understanding.

There can be no doubt that the construction to which I have referred has been placed upon the favored-nation clause by Great Britain, and it is the undoubted and undisputed construction which it will receive. As to the construction which Canada or Great Britain places upon their treaties with other nations, this country has nothing to say.

It means, in brief, that in consideration for giving to Canada free access to our markets for her agricultural products we will be given the privilege of competing in Canadian markets on the same terms with the manufactured products of practically every other nation in the world and meeting in competition the cheaper labor of European countries, and, furthermore, on many of the articles covered by the agreement the British preferential rate is materially lower than the rates in the pro-

posed agreement and on a number of articles the French preferential rate, under the convention between France and Canada, is materially lower than the proposed rates. It seems strange indeed to me that no information whatever on this branch of the subject has been submitted to Congress, and we have been compelled, within the extremely short limit of time afforded, to find out what little we could in respect to it, and I reiterate with emphasis that a question of so much importance should have received some attention by the committee, that it should receive some attention by this House, and that it is, as I have said, of material importance in the consideration of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a passing reference to the question of the high cost of living and its relation to this measure. There are undoubtedly many who believe that the cost of living will be reduced if this measure passes. This can only result through lower prices on farm products, but even then I am not so sure that the consumer will receive the benefit unless it comes through a general depression. Important economic factors and, I might also add, powerful agencies intervene between the producer and the consumer. It is this intervening cost and these intervening agencies that present the real problem as to the cost of living. The price of farm products has varied during the past few years, sometimes dropping quite a few points, but I have failed to note any corresponding change in the price of secondary farm products to the consumer. I venture the prediction that if the price of farm products falls 10 per cent there will be no perceptible change in the cost of living, not, at least, that anyone could discover when he pays his weekly butcher or grocery bills.

If cheaper food products are desired irrespective of any principle involved, which seems to be the position of the advocates of this measure, then why did they not place them on the free list in the form in which they are consumed?

The beneficiaries will be the Canadians, the trusts, and the middleman. I am not speaking of trusts in a demagogic way. We all know that they are here and that the powerful machinery of the Government is seeking to bring them within the laws of the land. The Department of Justice, after a most careful and thorough investigation, determined that a combination in restraint of trade exists among the packers. The evidence was presented to the Federal grand jury, and indictments have been returned. Of course, both the packers and the millers will be special beneficiaries under this agreement. They will secure free raw material while retaining protection on their finished product. The farmer will sell his wheat and live cattle in a free-trade market, but when he buys his flour or fresh meats must buy them in a protected market.

If reduction in the cost of living was the controlling consideration in the minds of those who negotiated the agreement and who stand as its sponsors, then it seems strange to me that they confined themselves to the products of the farm. If this was their motive, without regard to principle, why did they not remove our duty on the textiles, which is a somewhat flourishing industry in Canada, for she has over 2,000 textile establishments, employing over 57,000 wage earners? And, again, they might have added leather goods, in which industry Canada has some 533 establishments, employing some 18,000 wage earners; and if this were done I wonder how many gentlemen from New England would enjoy it. It is easy for them to talk about placing this question on a high humane plane when it inures to their benefit. It is certainly a new and startling definition of humanity that excludes the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a word relative to print paper and wood pulp. The thought that these articles will come into the United States free of duty has undoubtedly commended itself most favorably to the press and magazines of our country, and yet it is clearly pointed out in the letter written by the Canadian commissioners to our Secretary of State that this matter rests entirely with the Canadian Provinces and that the agreement in this respect must be inoperative until the Provinces take action. There is nothing to prevent Congress passing a law removing the duty on print paper and wood pulp just as effectively as it will be accomplished under this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I can not at this time enter into a full discussion of the subject before us, nor have I attempted, as I stated in the beginning, to discuss the general subject of reciprocity, but have confined myself and in a brief and limited way only to the proposition immediately before us. I have simply endeavored to point out some of the reasons and adduce some facts bearing on the question of the effect of the proposed agreement on our farmers and also to showing that our manufacturers, especially of agricultural implements, will receive little, if

any, benefit. And the same may be said of the agreement in its entirety—in brief, the failure, so far as our country is concerned, to receive any equivalent for the valuable consideration passing to Canada.

The memory of the immortal McKinley has been summoned to conjure aid for the measure, but they do violence to his recorded words. Speaking on reciprocity, McKinley said:

What we want if we ever have reciprocity must be reciprocity with equality; reciprocity that shall be fair; reciprocity that shall be just; reciprocity that shall give us our share in the trade or agreement that we make with other nations of the world.

I submit in all candor that the proposed agreement fails to come within the definition of McKinley. It is neither equitable, fair, nor just.

Free trade in one class of products which both countries are producing is not reciprocity but competition. It is predicated upon no principle, justified by no precedent, and finds no support in any definition of reciprocity heretofore given.

I have believed and still believe in the Republican policy of protection. For over 20 years I have advocated it from the platform. I have appealed to our farmers to support the protective policy with a view of building up a home market. That market we now propose to give away. The protective policy of the Republican Party has heretofore been applied to all producers. That is the true policy—the consistent policy. I do not believe in half protection and half free trade. Let us have either the one or the other.

To those who favor reciprocity and who say that even if we are not getting any fair return in this agreement, nevertheless that it is a recognition of a policy, and as time goes on further concessions will be secured, I ask that if Canada is given the only thing she needs and wants—our markets for her agricultural products—what could the United States offer her in the future? And to those who cherish the hope that some time our Republic will extend over the American continent and who look upon this agreement as tending in that direction the same answer may be made.

If reciprocity is desired, let us wait until an agreement reciprocal in terms as well as name can be secured. If free trade is desired, let it be free trade for all. If the protective policy is desired, let it be a protection that is just and equitable and applicable to all classes alike. Whatever policy we adopt with Canada or with any other nation, let it be with justice to our own people first. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts reserve his time?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would consume some of his time.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, this rule is plain and speaks for itself. [Laughter and applause.] The purpose of it is manifest, to bring to an immediate vote, without amendment, the bill that has been under consideration for two days.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague allow me? The rule also provides, does it not, that the House shall pass a bill without its having been read in the House?

Mr. BOUTELL. It does; but it has been read attentively, I hope, by every Member of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. That is not new; I voted for such a rule; that is not new.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this rule are those that we have been made frequently familiar with under similar circumstances in rules reported by the chairman of the committee. This rule is based simply upon a recognition of the existing condition of things, namely, that a great majority of the Republican Members of the House are in favor of this bill and wish to vote on it without delay. [Cries of "Oh!"] And it is known also that this bill can not pass so as to become effective and carry out the intention of the contracting parties if we amend it here. Therefore the rule has been reported in its present shape to bring the bill to an immediate vote without amendment. Now, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, there are 14 legislative days left of this session. There are still undisposed of the naval appropriation bill, the sundry civil bill, the deficiency bill, and the diplomatic appropriation bill. Under any circumstances it will be difficult to pass all of these bills unless some are passed under suspension of the rules. The bill now pending in the House has been debated for two days. Some gentlemen express a desire for an opportunity to amend it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] voted for a rule on the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill which prevented amendments being offered to over 90 per cent of the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is the gentleman anxious—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman correct in saying that I voted for a rule to prevent amendments upon the Payne tariff bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman voted for a rule which was reported, which practically prevented amendments to be offered to the Payne-Aldrich bill. Who are demanding opportunities to offer amendments to this bill? Do the gentlemen in good faith desire to perfect it or do they desire to defeat it? I remember the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] upon the Payne bill when he said that he would put a tariff so high upon everything coming in this country that it would be impossible to bring anything in at all; and yet he is the one who wishes a chance to offer amendments to this bill to put a number of articles on the free list.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have not changed my views.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What a farce it would be to give such gentlemen an opportunity to filibuster and waste the time of this House in idle work, and thus prevent this bill, if possible, going to the Senate in time to pass there, in order that such a ridiculous performance might be had so as to demonstrate that the gentleman from Michigan has been converted by the results of the last election.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I desire to offer an amendment that will not defeat this bill, but perfect it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not talking to the gentleman from Louisiana. I decline to yield. I have only five minutes. I am not impugning the good faith of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. I did not know that he had designed to offer amendments putting anything on the free list. He would not have the temerity—

Mr. BROUSSARD. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that I have no such desire.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I will not. I did not hear the gentleman assert that he wished to put anything on the free list.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York declines to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, and the gentleman from New York controls his five minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yield to me?

Mr. BROUSSARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Has the gentleman from New York the right to state that the gentleman from Louisiana intends to introduce an amendment to put anything on the free list?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] did not propose to offer amendments to this bill for the purpose of putting on the free list articles to be imported into this country.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asserts that the Democratic Party split on the 15th of March, 1909, when an attempt was made to reform the rules of the House. Thank God, since that time we have come together, and have lived long enough to witness a more disastrous break on the Republican side, not upon a mere question of procedure in this House, but on a question of fundamental importance to the welfare of all people of the country. And, if the gentleman can take any satisfaction from the condition which now exists on that side of the House and that which exists on this side of the House, he is welcome to it. [Applause.] [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased to hear gentlemen on this side of the House applaud my colleague from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] when he declined to yield me the floor, because I distinctly recall the occasion when gentlemen who were applauding were exerting all of their efforts to condemn in unqualified terms both the gentleman from New York and myself; and I assume that part of this applause belonged to me.

I did not intend to offer any amendment to this bill that would defeat its purpose. I wish to say that I am still a member of the Ways and Means Committee, though possibly not a satisfactory member to a great many of my colleagues on this side of the House. Nevertheless, I am still a member of that committee, and I say that possibly, with one or two exceptions,

there is scarcely any member of that committee who has a knowledge of this bill as it is presented for passage in the House at this time. I had hoped that opportunity would be afforded to amend the bill, not with a view to defeating its provisions, because I realize that a majority of this House—certainly a majority on this side of the Chamber, and possibly a majority on the other side of the Chamber—favor its passage. But I had intended to offer an amendment which I had drafted, and which I have here, and which I shall insert in the Record, by which, after having conceded to the farm producers of Canada the markets of the United States in exchange, as it is alleged by those who are advocating this bill, and given the manufacturers an opportunity to compete on the Canadian market, that we should at least have had a square deal in that exchange. But I am warned by the position taken by the minister of finance of Canada, who was one of the commissioners who helped to draft this measure, who unquestionably, in so far as I know, knows better what the provisions of this bill are than any other man in this country, who states that the Canadians who are attached to the mother country and who heretofore have conceded a preferential duty to the British manufacturer shall still continue after this duty is ratified to control the Canadian market to the exclusion of the American manufacturer.

It was my purpose to introduce a resolution similar to the resolution which was introduced and passed by this House when the first Cuban reciprocity proposition was under consideration here, by which we proposed to take off the differential in exchange for the reduction of the duty on raw sugar coming from Cuba, and which bill died in committee of the Senate, the reason for which may be inquired of the Sugar Trust, as possibly the same inquiry as to the duty on taxed meat may be inquired of the Meat Trust; and to the second Cuban reciprocity measure, which subsequently became a law, by which it seems as though we declared, as a matter calculated to allay the feeling of the people of this country, that we did not concede the right of the Executive of the United States to originate bills affecting the revenues and give us the veto power, but that we stood by the Constitution, which gives the House of Representatives the right to originate bills affecting the revenue and retains the veto power in the Executive. These amendments were put upon both of those propositions, and when the second one passed it became a law without affecting the agreement between Cuba and the United States. And, certainly, if we propose to hold the advantage in the Canadian market for the manufacturers of this country who are to receive all the profits of this interchange of commerce, there ought to be a provision in this bill that whenever, as Mr. Fielding declares, the Canadian Parliament shall grant further preferential rates to British manufactured goods over American manufactured goods, the President of the United States shall become in duty bound to notify the Government of the Dominion of Canada to suspend this act and to notify the Canadian Government that the treaty is at an end. This is the provision I had drafted:

SEC. 3. Whenever the Dominion of Canada shall, by treaty or legislation enacted by its Parliament or by the Provisional Governments of the Dominion of Canada, concede to Great Britain a preferential duty greater than that granted the United States under this act, then it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to notify the Government of the Dominion of Canada that this act is suspended, and the treaty between the United States and the Dominion of Canada shall terminate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts grant me just one minute more?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I am sorry, but I can not.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Half a minute?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; half a minute.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Thank you. Shall it be said that we concede the market for the raw products of Canada in exchange for manufactured goods, and shall Great Britain take that away from us also, and we receive nothing in return? [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] whether he intends to close in one speech.

Mr. BOUTELL. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that I have received no further requests to speak.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a question in his time?

Mr. BOUTELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor now.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Illinois, as I understand, will close in one speech. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say and very little time allotted to me in which to say it. [Laughter and applause.] To my surprise I have heard on this side of the Chamber some speeches in support of this bill from men whom I have always regarded as orthodox Republicans, which contain almost as much old-fashioned Democratic doctrine as I have ever heard fall from the lips of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is heir apparent to the throne of Democracy in the next House. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I fear that the Republican Party has reached a crisis in its history. [Laughter and cries of "Good" on the Democratic side.] But it has safely passed through other crises, and I hope and believe that it will do so again. The provisions of this treaty, although championed by some distinguished Republicans, are not in harmony with the principles of the Republican Party, as I understand them; and I want to say frankly that if these provisions had been embodied in the Payne tariff bill I would have voted against it. Furthermore, I do not believe that with these provisions in it the bill could have passed this House. The present President of the United States is a great and good man. He has given us a splendid administration so far, and has done much for the promotion of the business interests of the country. But I must differ with him when he says that this treaty is not violative of the principles of protection as propounded by those who advocate them. Neither do I regard it as in harmony with the doctrine of reciprocity as advocated by Blaine and McKinley. If it is, then I have misinterpreted what they said. No proposition which subjects an industry in this country to unrestricted competition with a like industry in another country, and to the detriment of the former, can, in my humble opinion, be in harmony with the doctrine of protection as the Republican Party has taught it. And this proposed treaty does that.

Mr. Speaker, when the Payne tariff bill was pending in the House, I worked earnestly and unceasingly with many other gentlemen who are here to-night to retain a protective duty upon lumber, and everyone who participated in that contest knows that the chief argument in favor of that protective duty was the alleged injurious effect that Canadian competition, in the absence of such a duty, would have on our lumber industry. No subject involved in that bill was more thoroughly discussed than was this subject of protection to lumber. In fact, if any subject was exhausted in that discussion it was this one; and Congress, after the fullest consideration of every phase of it, deliberately decided to retain a protective duty upon lumber. Now comes this treaty proposing to nullify what we did then.

When I was elected to the Sixty-first Congress I pledged myself to stand by protection to lumber in the revision of the tariff which we then knew was shortly to follow, and I was elected on that pledge. I carried out the pledge, went back to my people, and they approved my course by sending me back to the Sixty-second Congress. I construe that as a direction that I continue to stand by it, and I can not stultify myself by now voting against what I advocated then and what my people have indorsed, and I feel that it is my duty to take this position regardless of the exalted source from which this reciprocity proposition comes. I would vote against it if I stood alone in that vote on this side of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why I am opposed to this treaty. It proposes to put practically everything that the farmer produces on the free list so far as Canada is concerned. I represent a district composed largely of farmers. We have always argued that protection to farm products was advantageous to the farmer; and the present high prices that they are receiving for their products and the prosperity which they have enjoyed under the protective tariff law vindicate the argument.

I can understand how gentlemen whose constituencies are consumers rather than producers of farm products can take a different view of it, and how the President, having, in a sense, the whole country for his constituency, may consider that in the aggregate more people would be benefited than injured by this treaty; but I regard it as my duty to stand by what I conceive to be the best interests of the people who sent me here. It is true that there are a good many people in my district who would be benefited by a reduction in the price of farm products, but it would injure more people there than it would benefit. Whenever, as in this instance, it is impossible for me to take a course which will be beneficial to everyone whom I represent, then the only course to pursue is the one which will bring the greatest good to the greatest number, which after all is the most that good government can accomplish.

I am not, however, in favor of that selfish application of the principles of protection which will protect what my constituents produce and not what they consume. I believe rather in an equitable distribution of protective rates, so as to fairly distribute its benefits as well as its burdens. This treaty is not framed in accordance with that theory. It puts upon the free list the finished products of the farmer's labor and yet retains a duty upon those products in their manufactured state. As I view it, the manufacturer, rather than the farmer, will be benefited by it, and it will be more beneficial to foreigners than to our own people. I do not see how any Republican can justify putting wheat on the free list and flour on the protected list, or cattle on the free list, and dressed beef on the protected list, or how he can defend a proposition which would compel the farmer to sell what he produces in a free-trade market and buy what he consumes in a protected market.

Gentlemen talk about the necessity for relief of the consumer. The farmers belong to that class as well as do those who are engaged in other avocations. The farmer does not produce everything that he consumes, and it is not just to him to subject his products to Canadian competition which will reduce their price, and yet compel him to purchase that which he consumes, but does not produce, in a market which is protected from like competition.

It has been contended in this debate that Canada is such a small country, comparatively, that the effect of its competition upon this country will be infinitesimal. I fail to see the consistency between that argument and the other argument, which is also offered by the advocates of the treaty, that it will reduce the cost of living. In other words, according to their arguments, it is too small to do any harm to our farmers, but it is big enough to help the consumers of farm products by reducing the price to them.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this treaty, whether it is so intended by its proponents or not, as the initial step in the direction of free trade. It may be a good thing for the people of my district, but I do not believe it; and I am from Pike County, Ky., and you will have to "show me" before I do believe it. [Laughter.] I am an Abraham Lincoln-James G. Blaine-William McKinley Republican. I was born a protectionist and raised a protectionist, and I do not propose to go back on my raisin' at this late date. I believe that this treaty is un-Republican, and I shall vote against it. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] two minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the argument that has been made here in the discussion of this bill that any amendment would mean the defeat of the agreement, is not based upon what I believe to be the facts. I would have been glad to have an opportunity, had I not been cut off by this rule, to offer an amendment to put meats, for instance, on the free list. Under this bill there is a tariff left on fresh meats. If the farmer is to be deprived of the duty on cattle, then, it seems to me, that the Beef Trust ought to be deprived of the tariff on fresh meats, and that amendment would not have endangered this bill. It would simply have given more to the Canadians than they have been asking for. I would have been glad to offer an amendment to put lumber and coal on the free list. It seems to me if the farmer is to have all the products of the farm to put upon the free list, then he ought to have the opportunity of buying from the same people who have the benefit of the American market, without any tax on lumber.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I can not yield in two minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I knew the gentleman would not yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to give notice now that if I can get recognition at the proper time I intend to move to recommit this bill, with instructions to put on the free list some of the things that the farmer has to buy, none of which will endanger the contract or the so-called treaty that has been made with the Canadian Government.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Did you vote against the proposition to recommit the Payne bill?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and I did not have any proposition like this confronting me when I voted against it, either.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes, you did.

Mr. NORRIS. If the gentleman thinks that is a contradiction, I want to ask him where he will be standing if he gets an opportunity to vote to recommit this bill and put on the free list some of the things that it is necessary for the farmer to buy, and, if having that opportunity, he votes against it.

It would be perfectly feasible to amend this bill by taking lumber and coal and some other articles from the list of dutiable articles in this bill that are imported from Canada into the United States and put them on the free list. This would in no way abrogate the so-called treaty, and if we did this it would not make it necessary to send the agreement back for further agreement or consultation. It would simply be giving Canada a greater concession than she is asking for. If the farmer must lose all the protection on what he produces and has to sell, then, in common justice, take the tariff off on some of the things he has to buy.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this rule and against this bill, because, though I come from a great city, which it is claimed this bill will benefit, I am a Republican and a protectionist. [Applause.] This bill will not benefit the great cities and industrial centers, but it will injure the great farming areas of the country. It is in opposition to Republican policies and in accord with Democratic policies, and I trust it will not become a law in this Congress, which is Republican in both branches. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have two minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule which is brought in here to make possible the forcing through without amendment the pending bill to carry into effect the proposed trade agreement, called by some Canadian reciprocity. I shall vote against the rule and against the bill. I can not express in language strong enough my opposition to this proposition to lead the American farmer to slaughter.

Geographically the State of Maine is already projected into Canada, being nearly surrounded by Canadian territory. This measure will enable the Canadians to surround the State commercially and annex it to Canadian conditions so far as its commodity prices go. It is a sad thing to me to see such treachery to the great principles of protection. I can readily understand why it is that the Democratic Party in this House has bound itself together, in caucus and on this floor, to give this trade agreement full support by practically a solid Democratic vote.

Reciprocity such as Blaine and McKinley supported could consistently travel hand in hand with protection. They believed in the admission free to this country products of another country which we did not produce in exchange for the privilege of having the products of our country admitted free to the markets of such country.

Under this Canadian agreement Canadian farm products would flow into our markets in competition with the products of our farmers, reducing the demand for our products, as practically none of the products of the American farmer will find a market in Canada.

What I state in regard to farm products will apply with equal force to the products of our forests and lumber manufacturers. The competition that will be developed under this trade agreement may, in practice, become even more serious than now contemplated by the supporters of the bill. The farmers, lumbermen, and others engaged in industries affected by it, under the conditions and laws existing in the United States are compelled to deal with high-priced labor. Contract-labor laws prohibit our citizens from seeking labor outside the country. No such law exists in Canada. The Canadian producer can import low-priced labor from Europe without limit if he so desires, and, in addition, I am informed the Government pays a head bounty to the steamboat lines bringing laborers to the country if they are considered desirable and come to stay. Canada has no exclusion laws such as ours against the countless millions of the Orient. The fact that they have not swarmed into the Dominion excessively up to now does not preclude the possibility that they may once the markets of more than 90,000,000 of Americans are opened to the products from the territory north of us.

If the principles of protection against the low-priced labor of Europe that have so long been upheld by the Republican Party are to be abandoned, if the Republican doctrine of home markets for home producers is unsound and can no longer be up-

held, if in the future tariff duties are to be imposed only when necessary, and then only to the extent necessary to secure revenue for the Government, and if we are to approach free trade as near as possible, then it is perfectly consistent to enact this trade agreement.

So far as the agricultural interests of our lumbering industries are concerned, this agreement would not impose any greater hardship upon them had its free-trade provisions extended to the whole world, as their only competitors now or in the future are or will be the Canadians.

Supporters of this measure claim it should be viewed from a broad national standpoint, and I have tried to look at it from such a standpoint rather than from that of any section or industry. But even then I fail to find justification for it. The high cost of living being the cause of much complaint and one of the chief reasons offered in support of this trade agreement, on the theory it will lower prices by making Canadian food products available to increase the supply in the American market, and it will undoubtedly lower the price of farm products; but in my opinion the cost of living will not be materially affected, as the causes of the high cost of living will still exist.

The present method and standard of living is largely responsible for the increased cost, as well as the distributing agencies that stand between the producers and the consumers. The extent to which these distributing agencies are responsible for present prices is well illustrated by the fact that potatoes that the Maine farmer is now selling for about 30 cents per bushel are being retailed in New York City at rates ranging from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per bushel.

The trade agreement will not reduce the cost of living, but it will reduce the price the farmer will receive for his product, owing to the market being divided with the Canadian farmer, with the result that the value of American farms will be lowered and agricultural pursuits in the United States become less attractive. From a broad national standpoint, I believe it far better to safeguard our agricultural interests. We have in this country vast agricultural areas yet untouched, and those that are occupied are capable under improved methods of cultivation of vastly increasing their production.

In view of these facts, why should we annex through this agreement the limitless agricultural areas of Canada? Continuation of fair prices to the farmer will develop and extend our agricultural districts, on which our whole prosperity as a Nation is dependent.

Only fair prices for farm products now prevail; lower them and continue them at a lower level and we shall read again of the abandoned farms. For my part I do not wish to see a repetition of the depressed agricultural conditions that prevailed prior to 1900. In my opinion it is an unfair agreement, as it continues protection for the manufacturing interests and denies it to the agricultural interests. From a revenue point of view the Government will suffer through the loss of revenue and Canada gain through remission of duties far more than we. Our Government will surrender duties amounting to \$4,849,933, based on the importations from Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, while Canada, on the basis of imports from the United States for a like period, will surrender duties amounting to \$2,560,579.

The agreement is justified by the President on the ground that—

in Canada conditions as to wages and character of the wage earner and transportation to market differ but little from those prevailing with us.

I believe he is misled as to the facts. Being somewhat familiar with the agricultural development in eastern Canada and labor conditions there from personal investigation, and knowing that a wide difference exists both as to conditions and wages, which are very much lower, on the day this trade agreement was submitted to Congress I requested the Commerce and Labor Department to investigate and report as to wages paid on each side of the international boundary line from Maine to the State of Washington—believing that such investigation and report would sustain my own opinion. The department has made its report to me to the extent of covering the eastern section of Canada and the United States, and it contains an almost universal and wide difference in the wage scale of the two countries. This report establishes definitely the unequal conditions that laborers and producers on this side of the line will have to contend with in the event of the adoption of this measure.

This report deals with farm wages prevailing along the Canadian border from the Atlantic up to and including the western boundary of New York State on both sides of the international border, and was compiled in the first part of February, 1911;

and I will state the facts it presents for the information of the House.

Farm wages prevailing along the Canadian border.

United States side.		Canadian side.	
In the vicinity of—	Average monthly wages, including board.	Canadian locality corresponding to that shown in the United States.	Average monthly wages, including board.
Eastport, Me.....	\$25 to \$30	Halifax, Nova Scotia.....	\$15 to \$25
Calais, Me.....	20 to 30	Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.....	15 to 30
Vanceboro, Me.....	20 to 25	St. John (N. B.) district.....	15 to 20
Houlton, Me.....	30	do.....	15 to 20
Fort Fairfield, Me.....	30	do.....	20 to 25
Van Buren, Me.....	27 to 40	do.....	24
Fort Kent, Me.....	25 to 30	do.....	18 to 25
		do.....	20 to 25
Average eastern Maine..	25 to 31	Average Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.	17 to 24
Lowelltown, Me.....	32	Province of Quebec.....	31
Beechers Falls, N. H.....	20	do.....	15
Newport, Vt.....	25 to 28	do.....	18 to 22
Island Pond, Vt.....	25	do.....	18 to 20
St. Albans, Vt.....	20 to 30	do.....	8 to 20
Albany, Vt.....	25 to 30	do.....	15 to 25
Rouses Point, N. Y.....	22 to 25	do.....	18 to 20
Malone, N. Y.....	25	do.....	20 to 25
Fort Covington, N. Y.....	25	do.....	20 to 25
Average eastern New York.	23 to 27	Average Province of Quebec.	16 to 22
Nyando, N. Y.....	18 to 25	Province of Ontario.....	16 to 22
Ogdensburg, N. Y.....	25 to 30	do.....	20 to 25
Morristown, N. Y.....	20 to 25	do.....	15 to 20
Clayton, N. Y.....	26 to 28	do.....	24 to 26
Cape Vincent, N. Y.....	25 to 30	do.....	20 to 30
Charlotte, N. Y.....	25	do.....	16 to 25
Niagara Falls, N. Y.....	20 to 30		
Average western New York.	22 to 27	Average Province of Ontario bordering New York.	19 to 25

In August, 1854, Franklin Pierce, then President of the United States, proposed to Congress a reciprocity treaty with Canada which had been negotiated. It covered practically the same articles of commerce between the two countries that the present trade agreement does. The treaty proposed by President Pierce was at once given effect by the passage of the necessary legislation by Congress and continued until 1865, when a resolution was adopted by Congress terminating it, owing to the unsatisfactory results that it produced.

In a debate on the resolution to terminate the treaty of 1854 many interesting statements were made as to the operation of the treaty, its effect on imports and exports, as well as the revenue, and which are particularly interesting to note at this time. I will quote some of them.

The extent of trade before and after the treaty may be seen in a few figures.

In the three years immediately preceding the treaty the total exports to Canada and the other British provinces were \$48,216,518, and the total imports were \$22,588,577; being of exports to imports in the proportion of 100 to 46.

In the 10 years of the treaty the total exports to Canada and the other British provinces were \$256,350,931. The total imports were \$200,399,786. According to these amounts the exports were in the proportion of 100 to 78. If we take Canada alone we shall find the change in this proportion greater still. The total exports to Canada in the three years immediately preceding the treaty were \$31,846,865, and the total imports were \$16,589,624, being in the proportion of 100 to 52; while the total exports to Canada alone during the 10 years of the treaty were \$170,371,911, and the total imports were \$161,474,349, being in the proportion of 100 to 94.

I present these tables simply to lay before you the extent and nature of the change in the commerce between the two countries. But I forbear embarking on the much-debated inquiry as to the effect of a difference between the amount of exports and of imports, involving as it does the whole perilous question of the balance of trade. In the view which I take on the present occasion, it is not necessary to consider it. The reciprocity treaty can not be maintained or overturned on any contested principle of political economy.

I come, in the last place, to the influence of the treaty on the revenue of our country; and here the customhouse is our principal witness. The means of determining this question will be found in the authentic tables which have been published from time to time in reports of the Treasury, and especially in the report made to Congress at this session, which I have in my hand.

Looking at these tables we find certain unanswerable points. I begin with an estimate founded on the trade before the treaty. From this it appears that if no treaty had been made, and the trade had increased in the same ratio as before the treaty, Canada would have paid to the United States in the 10 years of the treaty at least \$16,373,880, from which she has been relieved. This sum is actually lost to the United States. In return Canada has given up \$2,650,890, being the amount it would have collected if no treaty had been made. Here is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

Here is another illustration, derived from the tables: During the 10 years of the treaty the United States have actually paid in duties to Canada alone \$16,802,962, while during this same period Canada has paid in duties to the United States the very moderate sum of \$930,447. Here again is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

The same inequality may be seen in another way. During the 10 years of the treaty dutiable products of the United States have entered Canada and the other Provinces to the amount of \$83,347,019, while during this same period dutiable products of Canada and the other Provinces have entered the United States only to the amount of \$7,750,482. During this same period free products of the United States have entered Canada and the other Provinces to the amount of \$118,853,972, while free products of Canada and the other Provinces have entered the United States to the amount of \$178,500,184. Here again is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

Add to these various results the statement in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which has just been laid on our tables, in the following words:

"The treaty has released from duty a total sum of \$42,333,257 in value of goods of Canada more than of goods the produce of the United States." (Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1864, p. 93.)

With the proposed trade agreement in force the low scale of wages for unskilled labor in Canada will have its effect on the lumber industry in the Eastern States and give a most decided advantage to Canadians engaged in similar industry there. Wages of thousands of men employed in the woods, on the drives, and in the sawmills in the Eastern States will have to be lowered in order to enable the employers of such labor here to meet the competition of the exporters of Canadian lumber.

Should the lower scale of wages that prevail in Canada cause competition with our lumber industry to become extensive it would be serious, as the lumber industry and all occupations growing out of it are great and important and employ great numbers of men.

Agricultural products seem to be particularly selected for free trade competition in this agreement. Without attempting to enumerate all the products of the farm that are put on the free list by the agreement, I will call attention to some of the leading items as well as the present duty now imposed by the Canadian and United States Governments which it is proposed to abolish entirely:

Some farm products and the present duty imposed by the United States and Canadian Governments which it is proposed to abolish.

Articles.	Rate of duty.		Proposed reciprocal.
	United States.	Canadian, general.	
Live animals:			
Cattle, less than 1 year old.	\$2 each.....		
Cattle, other, valued not more than \$14 per head.	\$3.75 each.....	25 per cent.....	Free.
Cattle, valued more than \$14 per head.	27½ per cent.....		
Horses and mules, valued at \$150 or less per head.	\$30 each.....	\$12.50 each, or 25 per cent.	Do.
Horses and mules, valued at over \$150 per head.	25 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	Do.
Swine.....	\$1.50 each.....	1½ cents per pound..	Do.
Sheep, 1 year old or over.do.....	25 per cent.....	Do.
Sheep, less than 1 year old (lambs).	75 cents each.....do.....	Do.
All other live animals...	20 per cent.....do.....	Do.
Poultry, alive.....	3 cents per pound..	20 per cent.....	Do.
Poultry, dead.....	5 cents per pound..	20 per cent or 27½ per cent.	Do.
Wheat.....	25 cents per bushel..	12 cents per bushel..	Do.
Rye.....	10 cents per bushel..	10 cents per bushel..	Do.
Oats.....	15 cents per bushel..do.....	Do.
Barley.....	30 cents per bushel..	15 cents per bushel..	Do.
Buckwheat.....	15 cents per bushel..do.....	Do.
Peas, dried.....	25 cents per bushel..do.....	Do.
Beans, edible, dried.....	45 cents per bushel..	25 cents per bushel..	Do.
Corn, sweet corn or maize (except into Canada for distillation).	15 cents per bushel..	Free.....	Do.
Hay.....	\$4 per long ton.....	\$2 per short ton.....	Do.
Straw.....	\$1.50 per long ton.....do.....	Do.
Cowpeas.....	25 cents per bushel..	15 cents per bushel..	Do.
Fresh vegetables:			
Sweet potatoes and yams.....do.....	10 cents per bushel..	Do.
Potatoes.....do.....	20 cents per bushel..	Do.
Onions.....	40 cents per bushel..	30 per cent.....	Do.
Turnips.....	25 per cent.....do.....	Do.
Cabbages.....	2 cents each.....do.....	Do.
All others, not elsewhere specified.	25 per cent.....do.....	Do.
Dairy products:			
Butter.....	6 cents per pound..	4 cents per pound..	Do.
Cheese.....do.....	3 cents per pound..	Do.
Fresh milk.....	2 cents per gallon..	3½ cents per pound..	Do.
Fresh cream.....	5 cents per gallon..do.....	Do.
Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.	5 cents per dozen..	8 cents per dozen..	Do.

During the last fiscal year 39,810 dozen of eggs, on which a duty of 5 cents per dozen was paid, came into this country from Canada; relieved of the duty I should expect to see this product of the farm very largely increased and in competition in the American market with our own products of this class.

During the same period 980,036 pounds of butter were imported from Canada, paying a duty of 6 cents per pound. Place this great dairy product on the free list and the dairies of the United States will be placed in sharp competition with the great dairy farms of Canada.

Last year 43,613 bushels of apples were imported from Canada into the United States, paying a duty of 25 cents per bushel. Take this off and you will place the orchards of New England and the Eastern States in competition with the great orchards of Nova Scotia, which can not be excelled anywhere in the world and which are within easy and cheap transportation to the eastern markets of the United States, and capable of very largely supplying these markets and to the exclusion to that extent of the products of our own orchards.

Last year 946,479 bushels of oats came across our northern border, paying a duty of 15 cents per bushel. With the duty off the great fields of Canada would enormously increase their export of this important crop to the United States to the great disadvantage of the American growers of this grain.

During the year ending June 30, 1910, 96,507 tons of Canadian hay came into this country, paying a duty of \$4 per ton and making in the aggregate more than \$771,350. Remove this duty and you will not only contribute this great sum to the Canadian farmer, but you will find he will multiply his export of this important product to the great hay markets of the Eastern States to the exclusion of the American growers of hay.

No more important crop is grown by the New England farmer. I have long contended that it was, year by year, the most valuable crop grown by the Maine farmers, who find a ready market for their surplus hay in the Boston market.

Open the tariff door, take off the \$4 duty, and New England farmers will find when they seek to sell their hay in Boston that that hitherto excellent market for their product is being supplied by the farmers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, who are, as I have said, within easy and cheap water transportation to Boston.

And the western farmers will find the same condition in the New York market, which is in close and direct railroad communication with the rich farming country within the Province of Ontario. When the price of potatoes is low it is probably true that the duty of 25 cents per bushel is not so important as in those years when a fair market price prevails in the Boston and New York markets, at which times but for the duty the influx of Canadian potatoes would lower the market price below a fair price.

During the past two years low prices have prevailed for potatoes. Regardless, however, of these market conditions, the Canadians last year paid duty on 97,138 bushels of potatoes shipped into the United States, which is but a bagatelle to the amount that would be shipped by the Canadian farmers to the American potato markets if the duty were abolished as now proposed.

Potato growing is one of the great industries of the farmers. Portions of Canada are particularly well adapted to it. Take down the protective tariff on this product and the competition with Canada in this line would become fierce. In Maine alone millions of dollars are received and disbursed annually through this great agricultural product. Remove the duty and a ruinous blow would be struck at this industry. Farm values would be lowered, equities in farms would be sacrificed, competition with the low-priced lands of Canada with their cheap water transportation in the eastern Provinces to New York and Boston markets and the low-priced labor would be impossible and could not be met by Maine or New England farmers. The results that will follow the adoption of this trade agreement will prove to be so serious that I would not be representing my constituency, or what I believed to be for the good of the whole country, if I did not exercise every effort possible to prevent its passage in this Congress.

In conclusion I will state, as I stated in the beginning, that I can not express in language strong enough my opposition to this measure. I am opposed to giving away the American market.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate based on the assumption that we

can not amend a reciprocity convention. Now, you gentlemen can not shield yourselves behind that argument, because you know that it is not so. I published in the Record, and I have stated repeatedly since this debate began, when many of you gentlemen were away from the House, that when the reciprocity between Canada and the Republic of France was considered in the French Chamber of Deputies, and afterwards in the French Senate, the French Senate refused to be bound by the declaration that they could not amend it.

On the contrary, on April 1, 1909, the French Senate adopted an amendment changing the agreement materially, and Canada promptly conceded the terms demanded by France.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

Mr. DALZELL. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 107, answered "present" 5, not voting 73, as follows:

YEAS—200.

Adair	Denver	Humphreys, Miss.	Olmsted
Adamson	Dickinson	James	Padgett
Aiken	Dickson, Miss.	Jamieson	Palmer, H. W.
Alexander, Mo.	Dies	Johnson, Ky.	Parker
Alexander, N. Y.	Dixon, Ind.	Johnson, S. C.	Parsons
Anderson	Douglas	Jones	Peters
Ansbrey	Driscoll, D. A.	Kellher	Pou
Ashbrook	Dupre	Kinkead, N. J.	Rainey
Austin	Durey	Kitchin	Randell, Tex.
Barchfeld	Edwards, Ga.	Knowland	Rauch
Barnard	Ferris	Korbly	Reid
Barnhart	Finley	Kronmiller	Richardson
Bartholdt	Fish	Küstermann	Roberts
Bartlett, Ga.	Fitzgerald	Lamb	Robinson
Bartlett, Nev.	Flood, Va.	Latta	Roddenbery
Beall, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Law	Rucker, Mo.
Bell, Ga.	Foss	Lawrence	Shackleford
Bingham	Foster, Ill.	Lee	Sharp
Boehne	Gallagher	Lever	Sheffield
Booher	Garner, Pa.	Lively	Sheppard
Borland	Garrett	Lloyd	Sherley
Boutell	Gillespie	Longworth	Sherwood
Brantley	Gillet	McCall	Sims
Burgess	Godwin	McCreary	Sisson
Burke, Pa.	Goldfogle	McCredle	Slayden
Burnett	Gordon	McDermott	Slomp
Butler	Graft	McHenry	Small
Byrd	Graham, Ill.	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Iowa
Byrns	Greene	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Tex.
Calder	Gregg	McKinney	Sparkman
Candler	Griest	Macon	Stafford
Cantrill	Hamlin	Madden	Stanley
Carter	Hardy	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Tex.
Cassidy	Harrison	Mann	Stevens, Minn.
Clark, Mo.	Havens	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Ala.
Clayton	Hay	Massey	Taylor, Colo.
Cline	Heffin	Maynard	Taylor, Ohio
Cocks, N. Y.	Helm	Mays	Thomas, Ky.
Collier	Henry, Conn.	Miller, Kans.	Thomas, N. C.
Conry	Henry, Tex.	Miller, Minn.	Tilson
Cooper, Pa.	Higgins	Mitchell	Tou Velle
Covington	Hill	Moon, Pa.	Turnbull
Cox, Ind.	Hinshaw	Moon, Tenn.	Underwood
Cox, Ohio	Hitchcock	Morrison	Vreeland
Craig	Hobson	Moss	Watkins
Cravens	Houston	Needham	Weeks
Crumpacker	Howland	Nicholls	Weisse
Cullop	Hughes, Ga.	Nye	Wickliffe
Denby	Hughes, N. J.	O'Connell	Wiley
Dent	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Wilson, Ill.

NAYS—107.

Anthony	Foster, Vt.	Kennedy, Ohio	Pickett
Bradley	Fuller	Knapp	Plumley
Broussard	Gaines	Kopp	Pointexter
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, Mass.	Lafean	Pratt
Burleigh	Gardner, N. J.	Langham	Pray
Campbell	Garner, Tex.	Langley	Pujo
Chapman	Glass	Legare	Reeder
Cole	Goebel	Lenroot	Rodenberg
Cooper, Wis.	Good	Lindbergh	Scott
Cowles	Graham, Pa.	Loudenslager	Simmons
Creager	Grant	Lowden	Snapp
Currier	Gurnsey	Lundin	Southwick
Dalzell	Hamer	McLachlan, Cal.	Steenserson
Davidson	Hammond	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sterling
Davis	Hanna	Madison	Sulloway
Dawson	Haugen	Malby	Swayse
Dodds	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Thistlewood
Dwight	Hayes	Mondell	Thomas, Ohio
Ellis	Heald	Moore, Pa.	Volstead
Elvins	Hollingsworth	Morgan, Mo.	Wanger
Englebright	Hubbard, Iowa	Morgan, Okla.	Washburn
Esch	Hull, Iowa	Morse	Webb
Estopinal	Humphrey, Wash.	Moxley	Wheeler
Fairchild	Johnson, Ohio	Nelson	Woods, Iowa
Fassett	Keifer	Norris	Young, Mich.
Focht	Kendall	Olcott	The Speaker
Fordney	Kennedy, Iowa	Page	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Bennet, N. Y.	Calderhead	Riordan	Young, N. Y.
Burleson			

NOT VOTING—73.

Allen	Fornes	Livingston	Sabath
Ames	Fowler	Loud	Saunders
Andrus	Gardner, Mich.	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Cal.
Barclay	Gill, Md.	McMorran	Smith, Mich.
Bates	Gill, Mo.	Millington	Sperry
Bennett, Ky.	Goulden	Moore, Tex.	Spight
Bowers	Hamill	Morehead	Sturgiss
Capron	Hamilton	Mudd	Sulzer
Carlin	Hardwick	Murdock	Talbott
Cary	Howard	Murphy	Tawney
Clark, Fla.	Howell, N. J.	Palmer, A. M.	Townsend
Coudrey	Howell, Utah	Patterson	Wallace
Crow	Hubbard, W. Va.	Payne	Willett
Diekema	Huff	Pearre	Wilson, Pa.
Draper	Hughes, W. Va.	Prince	Wood, N. J.
Driscoll, M. E.	Joyce	Ransdell, La.	Woodyard
Edwards, Ky.	Kahn	Rhinock	
Ellerbe	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rothermel	
Foelker	Lindsay	Rucker, Colo.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On reciprocity, until adjournment or recess:

Mr. BURLESON (in favor) with Mr. TAWNEY (against).

Mr. STURGISS (in favor) with Mr. BARCLAY (against).

Mr. PAYNE (in favor) with Mr. CALDERHEAD (against).

Mr. DRAPER (in favor) with Mr. BENNET of New York (against).

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. SPIGHT.

Until further notice:

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. MOREHEAD with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. MILLINGTON with Mr. RUCKER of Colorado.

Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma with Mr. ROTHERMEL.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky with Mr. ELLERBE.

Mr. CARY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. CARLIN.

Mr. AMES with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. YOUNG of New York with Mr. FORNES.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if my colleague, Mr. DRAPER, voted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JAMES). He did not vote.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I voted nay, but I am paired with the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRAPER]. I therefore ask to have my name called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The name of Mr. BENNET of New York was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19 strike out all of lines 15 to 25, inclusive, and on page 20 strike out all of lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 24 strike out all of lines 4 to 11, inclusive, and insert the following as a new section:

"Sec. 2. Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than four cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper, being the products of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), shall have been imposed upon such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood pulp used in the manufacture of such paper or board."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill—

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion to recommit the bill with instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is opposed to the bill?

Mr. DALZELL. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. DALZELL. I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instruction to report the same back with the addition of the following articles to the reciprocal free list, to wit:

Fresh meat and all meat products, flour, prepared cereal foods, bran, agricultural implements, cotton ties and bagging, binding twine, and lumber.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the passage on the amendment.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I rise to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether or not he will consent to add to the instructions already read in his motion the following, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania has demanded the previous question, as has also the gentleman from Massachusetts. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and pending the disposition of that motion there is nothing else in order. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to recommit with instructions, which the Clerk has reported.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would like to inquire upon what the yeas and nays are demanded.

The SPEAKER. Upon the motion to recommit the bill with instructions.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 113, nays 196, answered "present" 3, not voting 73, as follows:

YEAS—113.

Anthony	Fassett	Kennedy, Ohio	Pickett
Bennet, N. Y.	Focht	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Plumley
Bradley	Fordney	Knapp	Poinexter
Broussard	Foster, Vt.	Kopp	Pratt
Burgess	Fuller	Lafean	Pray
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines	Langham	Prince
Burleigh	Gardner, Mass.	Langley	Pujo
Butler	Gardner, N. J.	Legare	Reeder
Campbell	Garner, Pa.	Lenroot	Seott
Chapman	Garner, Tex.	Lindbergh	Simmons
Cocks, N. Y.	Glass	Loudenslager	Snapp
Cole	Goebel	Lowden	Southwick
Cooper, Pa.	Good	Lundin	Steenerson
Cooper, Wis.	Graham, Pa.	McCreary	Sterling
Creager	Griest	McLachlan, Cal.	Sulloway
Currier	Guernsey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Swasey
Dalzell	Hamer	Malby	Thistlewood
Davidson	Hammond	Martin, S. Dak.	Thomas, Ohio
Davis	Hanna	Mondell	Volstead
Dawson	Hawley	Moore, Pa.	Wanger
Dodds	Hayes	Morgan, Mo.	Washburn
Dwight	Heald	Morgan, Okla.	Webb
Ellerbe	Hinshaw	Morse	Wheeler
Ellis	Hollingsworth	Moxley	Woods, Iowa
Elvins	Hull, Iowa	Nelson	Young, Mich.
Englebright	Humphrey, Wash.	Norris	The Speaker
Esch	Keifer	O'Connell	
Estopinal	Kendall	Olcott	
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Page	

NAYS—196.

Adair	Booher	Clayton	Dies
Adamson	Borland	Cline	Dixon, Ind.
Aiken	Boutell	Collier	Douglas
Alexander, Mo.	Bowers	Conry	Draper
Alexander, N. Y.	Brantley	Covington	Driscoll, D. A.
Anderson	Burke, Pa.	Cowles	Dupre
Ansberry	Burleson	Cox, Ind.	Durey
Austin	Burnett	Cox, Ohio	Edwards, Ga.
Barchfield	Byrd	Craig	Ferris
Barnard	Byrns	Cravens	Finley
Bartholdt	Calder	Crumpacker	Fish
Bartlett, Ga.	Candler	Cullop	Fitzgerald
Bartlett, Nev.	Cantrill	Denby	Flood, Va.
Beall, Tex.	Carter	Dent	Floyd, Ark.
Bell, Ga.	Cassidy	Denver	Foster, Ill.
Bingham	Clark, Fla.	Dickinson	Gallagher
Boehne	Clark, Mo.	Dickson, Miss.	

Garrett	Johnson, Ky.	Massey	Sheppard
Gillespie	Johnson, S. C.	Maynard	Sherley
Gillett	Jones	Mays	Sherwood
Godwin	Keliher	Miller, Kans.	Sims
Gordon	Kinhead, N. J.	Miller, Minn.	Sisson
Graff	Kitchin	Mitchell	Slayden
Graham, Ill.	Knowland	Moon, Pa.	Slemp
Greene	Korbly	Moon, Tenn.	Small
Gregg	Kronmiller	Morrison	Smith, Iowa
Hamill	Kuftermann	Moss	Smith, Tex.
Hamlin	Lamb	Needham	Sparkman
Hardy	Latta	Nicholls	Stafford
Harrison	Law	Nye	Stanley
Havens	Lawrence	Oldfield	Stephens, Tex.
Hay	Lee	Padgett	Stevens, Minn.
Hefflin	Lever	Palmer, H. W.	Taylor, Ala.
Helm	Lively	Parker	Taylor, Colo.
Henry, Conn.	Lloyd	Parsons	Taylor, Ohio
Henry, Tex.	Longworth	Peters	Thomas, Ky.
Higgins	McCall	Pou	Thomas, N. C.
Hill	McCredie	Rainey	Tilson
Hitchcock	McDermott	Randall, Tex.	Tou Velle
Hobson	McHenry	Rauch	Turnbull
Houston	McKinlay, Cal.	Reid	Underwood
Howland	McKinley, Ill.	Richardson	Vreeland
Hubbard, Iowa	McKinney	Roberts	Watkins
Hughes, Ga.	Macon	Robinson	Weeks
Hughes, N. J.	Madden	Rodenberg	Weisse
Hull, Tenn.	Madison	Rucker, Mo.	Wickliffe
Humphreys, Miss.	Maguire, Nebr.	Saunders	Wiley
James	Mann	Shackleford	Wilson, Ill.
Jamieson	Martin, Colo.	Sharp	Young, N. Y.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Calderhead

Olmsted

Riordan

NOT VOTING—73.

Allen	Gardner, Mich.	Livingston	Sabbath
Ames	Gill, Md.	Loud	Sheffield
Andrus	Gill, Mo.	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Cal.
Ashbrook	Goldfogle	McMorran	Smith, Mich.
Barclay	Goulden	Millington	Sperry
Barnhart	Grant	Moore, Tex.	Spight
Bates	Hamilton	Morehead	Sturgiss
Bennett, Ky.	Hardwick	Mudd	Sulzer
Capron	Haugen	Murdock	Talbot
Carlin	Howard	Murphy	Tawney
Cary	Howell, N. J.	Palmer, A. M.	Townsend
Coudrey	Howell, Utah	Patterson	Wallace
Crow	Hubbard, W. Va.	Payne	Willett
Diekema	Huff	Pearre	Wilson, Pa.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hughes, W. Va.	Ransdell, La.	Wood, N. J.
Edwards, Ky.	Johnson, Ohio	Rhinock	Woodyard
Foelker	Joyce	Roddenbery	
Fornes	Kahn	Rothermel	
Fowler	Lindsay	Rucker, Colo.	

So the motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CARY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. FORNES.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. RODDENBERY.

Mr. SHEFFIELD with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah with Mr. BARNHART.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 93, answered "present" 4, not voting 67, as follows:

YEAS—221.

Adair	Butler	Denver	Goldfogle
Adamson	Byrd	Dickinson	Gordon
Aiken	Byrns	Dickson, Miss.	Graff
Alexander, Mo.	Calder	Dies	Graham, Ill.
Alexander, N. Y.	Candler	Dixon, Ind.	Greene
Anderson	Cantrill	Douglas	Gregg
Ansberry	Carlin	Draper	Griest
Anthony	Carter	Driscoll, D. A.	Hamill
Ashbrook	Cary	Dupre	Hamlin
Austin	Cassidy	Durey	Hardy
Barchfield	Clark, Fla.	Edwards, Ga.	Harrison
Barnard	Clark, Mo.	Ellerbe	Havens
Bartholdt	Clayton	Ferris	Hay
Bartlett, Ga.	Cline	Finley	Heald
Bartlett, Nev.	Cocks, N. Y.	Fish	Hefflin
Beall, Tex.	Collier	Fitzgerald	Helm
Bell, Ga.	Conry	Flood, Va.	Henry, Conn.
Bingham	Cooper, Pa.	Floyd, Ark.	Henry, Tex.
Boehne	Cooper, Wis.	Foss	Higgins
Booher	Covington	Foster, Ill.	Hill
Borland	Cox, Ind.	Gallagher	Hinshaw
Boutell	Cox, Ohio	Garner, Pa.	Hitchcock
Bowers	Craig	Garner, Tex.	Hobson
Brantley	Cravens	Garrett	Hollingsworth
Brantley	Crumpacker	Gillespie	Houston
Burgess	Cullop	Gillett	Howland
Burke, Pa.	Denby	Glass	Hubbard, Iowa
Burnett	Dent	Godwin	Hughes, Ga.

Hughes, N. J.	McCreary	Olmsted	Smith, Tex.
Hull, Tenn.	McCredle	Padgett	Sparkman
Humphreys, Miss.	McDermott	Page	Stafford
James	McHenry	Parker	Stanley
Jameson	McKinlay, Cal.	Parsons	Stephens, Tex.
Johnson, Ky.	McKinley, Ill.	Peters	Stevens, Minn.
Johnson, S. C.	McKinney	Polindexter	Sulloway
Jones	Macon	Pou	Taylor, Ala.
Kelher	Madden	Rainey	Taylor, Colo.
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Madison	Randell, Tex.	Taylor, Ohio
Kinkaid, N. J.	Maguire, Nebr.	Rauch	Thomas, Ky.
Kitchin	Mann	Reld	Thomas, N. C.
Knowland	Martin, Colo.	Roberts	Tilson
Korby	Massey	Robinson	Tou Velle
Kronmiller	Mays	Roddenbery	Turnbull
Kuermann	Miller, Kans.	Roddenberg	Underwood
Lafean	Miller, Minn.	Rucker, Mo.	Vreeland
Lamb	Mitchell	Saunders	Watkins
Latta	Moon, Pa.	Shackelford	Weeks
Law	Moon, Tenn.	Sharp	Weisse
Lawrence	Morehead	Sheppard	Wickliffe
Lee	Morrison	Sherley	Willey
Legare	Moss	Sherwood	Wilson, Ill.
Lever	Needham	Sims	Young, Mich.
Lively	Nicholls	Sisson	Young, N. Y.
Lloyd	Nye	Slayden	
Longworth	O'Connell	Slemp	
McCall	Oldfield	Small	

NAYS—93.

Bennet, N. Y.	Focht	Knapp	Pray
Bradley	Fordney	Kopp	Prince
Broussard	Foster, Vt.	Langham	Pujo
Burke, S. Dak.	Fuller	Lenroot	Reeder
Burleigh	Gaines	Lindbergh	Scott
Campbell	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager	Simmons
Chapman	Gardner, N. J.	Lowden	Smith, Iowa
Cole	Goebel	Lundin	Snapp
Cowles	Good	McLachlan, Cal.	Southwick
Creager	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Steenerson
Currier	Grant	Malby	Sterling
Dalzell	Guernsey	Martin, S. Dak.	Swasey
Davidson	Hamer	Mondell	Thistlewood
Davis	Hammond	Moore, Pa.	Thomas, Ohio
Dawson	Hanna	Morgan, Mo.	Volstead
Dodds	Haugen	Morgan, Okla.	Wanger
Dwight	Hawley	Morse	Washburn
Ellis	Hayes	Moxley	Webb
Elvins	Hull, Iowa	Nelson	Wheeler
Englebright	Humphrey, Wash.	Norris	Woods, Iowa
Esch	Keifer	Olcott	The Speaker
Estopinal	Kendall	Pickett	
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley	
Fassett	Kennedy, Ohio	Pratt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Burleson	Calderhead	Langley	Riordan
----------	------------	---------	---------

NOT VOTING—67.

Allen	Gill, Mo.	McMorran	Sabath
Ames	Goulden	Maynard	Sheffield
Andrus	Hamilton	Millington	Smith, Cal.
Barclay	Hardwick	Moore, Tex.	Smith, Mich.
Bates	Howard	Mudd	Sperry
Bennett, Ky.	Howell, N. J.	Murdock	Spight
Capron	Howell, Utah	Murphy	Sturgiss
Coudrey	Hubbard, W. Va.	Palmer, A. M.	Sulzer
Crow	Huff	Palmer, H. W.	Talbot
Diekema	Hughes, W. Va.	Patterson	Tawney
Driscoll, M. E.	Johnson, Ohio	Payne	Townsend
Edwards, Ky.	Joyce	Pearre	Wallace
Foelker	Kahn	Ransdell, La.	Willett
Fornes	Lindsay	Rhinock	Wilson, Pa.
Fowler	Livingston	Richardson	Wood, N. J.
Gardner, Mich.	Loud	Rothermel	Woodyard
Gill, Md.	McGuire, Okla.	Rucker, Colo.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky with Mr. FORTES.

Mr. CROW with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HARDWICK.

On this vote:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. TALBOTT (against) with Mr. HENRY of Texas (in favor).

Mr. LANGLEY (against) with Mr. RICHARDSON (in favor).

Mr. McMORRAN (against) with Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey (in favor).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MCCALL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 10326. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10453. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10454. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 10327. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 5968. An act to pay Thomas P. Morgan, jr., amount found due him by Court of Claims;

H. R. 13936. An act for the relief of William P. Drummon;

H. R. 14729. An act for the relief of Capt. Evan M. Johnson, United States Army;

H. R. 19505. An act for the relief of Eugene Martin;

H. R. 21882. An act for the relief of Horace D. Bennett;

H. R. 23827. An act extending the provisions of section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894, and acts amendatory thereto, to the Fort Bridger abandoned military reservation in Wyoming;

H. R. 25234. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent to certain lands to Charles E. Miller;

H. R. 28214. An act providing for the levy of taxes by the taxing officers of the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes;

H. R. 30727. An act providing for the sale of certain lands to the city of Buffalo, Wyo.;

H. R. 31648. An act to authorize the county of Hamilton, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn.;

H. R. 31649. An act to authorize the county of Hamilton, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn.;

H. R. 32004. An act providing for the quadrennial election of members of the Philippine Assembly and Resident Commissioners to the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 17007. An act for the relief of Willard W. Alt;

H. R. 20375. An act to authorize certain changes in the permanent system of highways, District of Columbia;

H. R. 25679. An act for the relief of the Sanitary Water-Still Co.;

H. R. 26529. An act for the relief of Phoebe Clark;

H. R. 19747. An act for the relief of William C. Rich;

H. R. 31661. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to transfer the lighthouse tender *Wistaria* to the Secretary of the Treasury;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of John G. Stauffer & Son;

H. R. 23314. An act to authorize the employment of letter carriers at certain post offices;

H. R. 29715. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing bridges and approaches thereto across the Waccamaw River, S. C.;

H. R. 24749. An act revising and amending the statutes relative to trade-marks;

H. R. 30135. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 30886. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 32222. An act authorizing homestead entries on certain lands formerly a part of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 30899. An act to authorize the Great Western Land Co. of Missouri to construct a bridge across Black River;

H. R. 31161. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 25074. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Walter B. Chester*;

H. R. 6776. An act for the relief of Oliva J. Baker, widow of Julian G. Baker, late quartermaster, United States Navy;

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of R. A. Sisson;

H. R. 31171. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Liberty Bridge Co.," approved March 2, 1907;

H. R. 30888. An act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad;

H. R. 22688. An act to authorize the extension of Thirteenth Street NW. from its present terminus north of Madison Street to Piney Branch Road;

H. R. 25081. An act for the relief of Helen S. Hogan;

H. R. 30793. An act to authorize the Fargo & Morehead Street Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 31927. An act authorizing the town of Blackberry to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Itasca County, Minn.; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution for the relief of Thomas Hoynes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 15, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WOODYARD, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 10404) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way through lands of the United States to the Buckhannon & Northern Railroad Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2162), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on Militia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 28436) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2165), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 139) authorizing the printing of the message of the President, together with the report of the agent of the United States in the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2166), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10605) to amend the military record of Aaron T. Wakefield, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2160), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LAW, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 32767) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2161), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32737) granting a pension to William L. Hicklin, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 32775) to define whisky; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32776) to provide for the marking of distillers' packages of distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32777) to provide for the labeling of distilled spirits in packages of less than 5 gallons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 32778) setting aside certain lands in the State of North Dakota for a dairy experimental station, and other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Resolution (H. Res. 973) to pay Joseph M. McCoy for services to the Committee on Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 285) providing for the printing of a digest of the decisions of the Court of Claims, etc.; to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of Washington concerning tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, favoring election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 32779) granting a pension to Dale C. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 32780) granting an increase of pension to Edwin F. Spink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 32781) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Kyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 32782) for the relief of Rev. Ambrose D. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 32783) granting a pension to C. E. Burkitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 32784) granting an increase of pension to John H. La Pointe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 32785) for the relief of Jackson Taylor Vaun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 32786) granting a pension to Augusta Hartwell Macomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: A bill (H. R. 32787) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Coggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 32788) granting an increase of pension to Jesse R. Hendrix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 32789) granting an increase of pension to George W. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32790) granting an increase of pension to John J. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 32791) granting an increase of pension to John A. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 32792) granting an increase of pension to James Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32793) granting an increase of pension to Orin Kizer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32794) granting an increase of pension to James Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 32795) granting an increase of pension to Shadrach W. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Central Labor Unions of Lancaster and Depew, N. Y., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of Tiffin citizens, for battleship building in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Franklin County Bar Association, against bill providing for holding two terms each year of the circuit and districts courts of southern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of D. H. Carpenter and other citizens of Horton, Kans., favoring construction of battleship *New York* at Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Aransas Pass, Tex., for a survey of a 20-foot channel on line of present channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also petition of Licking Council, No. 90, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Newark, Ohio, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Deutrick Grange, No. 1621, Summit Station, Ohio, protesting against the trade agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. S. Gish, postmaster, and 60 citizens of Sterling, Ohio, for the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Pittsburg Branch of National League of Commission Merchants and Pittsburg Butter and Egg Exchange, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Welcome Council and Smoky City Council, No. 119, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg, Pa., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Amelia Grosscup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of Central Republican Club, for abrogation of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for Senate bill 10447, parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Howard Park Citizens' Association and the Interdenominational Ministers' Meeting, relative to Justice Daniel Thew Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Schawangunk Grange, No. 1018, Patrons of Husbandry, Minisink, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Musicians' Protective Union, Chester, Pa., for repeal of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Washington Camp No. 298, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Byers, Pa., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Washington Camp No. 82, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lenni Mills, Pa., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Legislature, protesting against the proposed measure before Congress which will abolish the pension agencies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution adopted by Local No. 1447, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the adoption of the illiteracy test in the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CONRY: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, State Merchants' Association of New York, and New York Produce Exchange, favoring the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of New York and Assembly of New York State, for construction of battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Local 527, Smithfield, Pa., for the illiteracy test in immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Petition of Dryden Grange, of Dryden, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Trades and Labor Council located at La Crosse, Wis., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Washington Camp No. 749, Patriotic Order Sons of America, West Milton, Pa., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of Local No. 994, Federation of Labor, Bennington, Vt., for restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the National Irrigation Congress about irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Ernest Bohn, of Central Federation Union, for the construction of the battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Carthage Board of Trade, of Carthage, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. H. Askawich, of De Kalb, Ill., against passage of a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of F. E. M. Cale, western advertising manager of McClure's Magazine, against increased postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of medical doctors of Gillespie, Ill., for Senate bill 10408; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Ill., favoring construction of battleship *New York* at a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Henson and Robinson & Co., Springfield, Ill., and citizens of Pawnee, Ill., against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Hardware Manufacturers' Association of the United States, the National League of Commission Merchants (Pittsburg branch), and E. V. Babcock & Co., of Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against the Canadian reciprocity measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the De Laval Separator Co., of New York, against placing the centrifugal cream separators on the free list in the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Brooklyn League, for building battleship *New York* in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial commending the passage of House bill 15413, requiring illiteracy tests of immigrants, as adopted by the following Washington Camps of the Patriotic Order Sons of America: No. 28, Adamstown; No. 40, New Holland; No. 274, Terre Hill; No. 556, Elizabethtown; No. 557, Lancaster; No. 699, Millersville; No. 559, Rothsville; No. 711, Mount Nebo; No. 613, Lincoln; No. 701, Hopeland, all in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of South Haven and Decatur, Mich., for the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, protesting against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens on rural routes of North Dakota, favoring House bill 26791; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of Upper Hood River Valley Progressive Association, many business firms of Portland, Oreg., and Garnett Cory Hardware Co., Medford, Oreg., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Oregon, against repeal of any part of the oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Local Union 393, San Jose, Cal., United Association Journeymen Plumbers, Gas and Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters and Helpers; Local Union No. 64, International Union of Steam Engineers, San Francisco; and Andrew T. Gallagher, secretary of San Francisco Labor Council, for the construction of the battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of citizens of McGregor, Tex., against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Harmony Grange, No. 92, Stepney Depot, Conn., and Trumbull (Conn.) Grange, No. 134, favoring a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of Francis M. Lyman, W. S. McCormick, George T. Odell, and other citizens of Utah, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKADE of New Jersey: Petition of American Federation of Labor, Local No. 125, Greenwich, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Washington Camps Nos. 709, of Spring Forge, Pa., and 771, of Gatchetville, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCCREDIE: Petition of W. B. Keir, Centralia, Wash., against a rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of residents of Carrollton, Wash., for Senate bill 404, for Sunday rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the De Laval Separator Co., against placing centrifugal cream separators on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of citizens of Sunbury, Pa., insisting that the battleship *New York* be built in a Government navy yard in compliance with the law of 1910; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Washington Camps Nos. 540, of Catawissa, Pa., and 105, of Berwick, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging the immediate enactment of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Highland, Mich., the missionary societies of the Highland Congregational Church, Highland; Joseph Guill and eight others, of Yale; Mrs. W. C. Dodge, of Almont; members of the South Park Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Port Huron; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the seventh congressional district of Michigan; and local Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Harbor Beach, all of the State of Michigan, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of the St. Peter's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of St. Clair, Mich., protesting against the Andrews bill (H. R. 30155) donating land to the Christian Brothers of St. Louis Province, in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Dawson, Barada, Humboldt, Louisville, and Plattsmouth, Nebr.; protesting against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Freeport Council, No. 148, and Aliquippa Council, No. 567, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Lincoln Commandery No. 42, Washington Camps Nos. 82, 570, 455, 52, 544, 334, 485, 134, and 184, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging enactment of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of Washington Camps Nos. 52, 445, and 82, Patriotic Order Sons of America; Councils Nos. 33, 208, 590, and 567, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Union No. 706, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Bethlehem, Pa., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Rock Stream (N. Y.) Grange, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Petition of City Council of Providence, R. I., favoring Senate bill 5677, promoting efficiency of Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Miantonomoh Council No. 7, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Providence, R. I., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of Local Camp No. 31, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Van Clevesville, W. Va., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Camp No. 11, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Summit Point; Local Camp No. 31, American Federation of Labor, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Brooklyn League, for battleship construction in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of many publishing firms of New York City, against increase of postal rates on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Mad River Grange, No. 71, of the Connecticut State Grange, for a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Lumber Dealers Association of Connecticut, for reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lumber Dealers' Association of Connecticut, State Grange, Trumbull Grange, and Harmony Grange, No. 92, for a parcels-post measure, full and complete; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Franklin County Bar Association, of Ohio, against holding of two terms annually of circuit and district courts of the southern district of Ohio, at Portsmouth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of citizens of Wisconsin, for construction of battleship *New York* in the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Wisconsin for liberal extension of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of Metal Trades Council, of Newark, N. J., and vicinity, for construction of battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Pittsburg Branch of the National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. KEAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

Mr. WETMORE. I present the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the fiscal year 1909, as required by statute. The same statute provides for the printing of the report, so that no action on the part of the Senate is required. I ask that the report may lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will lie on the table. The law provides for the printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called rural parcels-post bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 947, Patrons of Husbandry, of Huevelton, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of F. E. Hill, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Scott antioption bill relative to dealing in cotton futures, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS. I present a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution, in the absence of objection.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 45.

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the Congress of the United States, a bill known as the Salloway pension bill which provides that all veterans of the Mexican and Civil Wars shall receive a pension of \$15 per month at the age of 62, \$20 at the age of 65, \$25 at the age of 70, and \$36 per month at the age of 75 years. The bill also provides that all veterans who are wholly incapacitated to perform labor shall receive a pension of \$36 per month with no age limitation.

The bill above referred to has already passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote and is now pending in the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature go on record as favoring the early enactment of this bill and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded at once to the United States Senators from Michigan, urging them to use every effort to secure the passage of the bill.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. BURROWS. Let the resolution lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a communication here from the Grain Growers' Department of the National Union of American Society of Equity, addressed to the United States Senate, and also a short article from their magazine, entitled "Farmers and protective tariff," which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the United States Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

There being before you now for ratification or rejection a certain Canadian reciprocity agreement in which the members of our organization are interested, I beg, in its behalf, to file with your honorable body, as information and for consideration by the Members thereof, the following brief statement of our position on the subject:

Certain commercial and speculative interests made an effort to get the farmers of the United States to part with their grain crops last fall at prices that suited these interests. Their program then was only partially successful. Knowing what we do about that scheme, we have reasons to believe that these same interests, prompted by a firm determination to make the farmers bow to their will, are actively supporting the proposed tariff agreement with Canada and are using it as a subterfuge with which to gather about them more recruits to help carry out their deep-laid plot. Trade operations under such an agreement as the Canadian reciprocity bill will stop an otherwise possible increase in the production of farm products in the United States proportionate to our increase in population and gradually change the source of supply from the Mississippi Basin to the western plains of Canada.

With the tariff removed on raw farm products but retained on manufactured articles and the source of supply moved farther away from our centers of population, it is difficult to see how our brethren in the cities are going to profit much from any possible reduction in the cost of living.

The proposed Canadian reciprocity agreement is a nefarious concoction by manufacturers and middlemen which, if swallowed by Congress, will be a means of widening the already wide chasm between producer and consumer rather than causing any material reduction in the cost of living. Regardless of whether the farmers now are free traders or protectionists, it must be admitted that after having helped to build